

THE  
Churchman's Magazine.

---

VOL. 6.]

MAY AND JUNE, 1809.

[No. 3.]

---

BIOGRAPHY.

---

MEMOIR OF DANIEL WATERLAND, D. D.

[*From the Orthodox Churchman's Magazine and Review for November 1808.*]

**T**HIS learned and pious writer was born at Wailesby, three miles from Market Raisin, in the county of Lincoln. He received his school education at Lincoln, and his academical at Magdalen College, in Cambridge, where he had Mr. Samuel Barker, a person of considerable worth and abilities, for his tutor. Mr. Waterland first obtained a scholarship, and next a fellowship in his college, in which also he became an eminent tutor, and a distinguished ornament. In his capacity of tutor, he drew up a masterly tract, intituled "Advice to a Young Student, with a Method of Study for the four first years." This pamphlet, though anonymous, was so well received by the public, as to go through several editions in a few years.

In 1713 he was appointed master of his college, on which occasion he took his degrees of Bachelor and Doctor in Divinity, at the commencement. His first question was "whether Arian Subscription was lawful?" A question worthy of him who had the integrity to abhor, with a generous scorn, all prevarication, and the capacity to see through those evasive arts by which some endeavoured to palliate their disingenuity. When Dr. James, the divinity professor, attempted to answer his thesis, and to embarrass the question with the dexterity of a person long practised in all the arts of a subtle disputant, our divine immediately replied in an extempore discourse of above half an hour in length, with such an easy flow of proper and significant words, and such an undisturbed presence of mind, as if he had been reading what he afterwards printed, "The Case of the Arian Subscription considered, and the Supplement to it:" he

unravelled the professor's fallacies, reinforced his own reasonings, and showed himself so perfect a master of the language, the subject, and himself, that all present agreed no one ever appeared to greater advantage. There were several members of the University of Oxford there, who mentioned, with pleasure, the great applauses he received, and the uncommon satisfaction which he gave. He was happy in a first opponent, one of the brightest ornaments of the Church, Dr. Sherlock, afterwards Bishop of London, who gave full play to his abilities on this occasion, and called forth all that strength of reason of which he was so great a master.

About this time he was presented to the rectory of Ellingham, in Norfolk, and soon after was appointed chaplain in ordinary to George I. In 1716 he published a thanksgiving Sermon for the suppression of the rebellion: but his masterly performance was "A Vindication of Christ's Divinity," which was printed in one volume octavo in 1719, the same year that Dr. Clarke published a second edition of his "Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity."

The unanswerable performance of Dr. Waterland against the Arian hypothesis, occasioned his being appointed, by Dr. Robinson, Bishop of London, to preach the first set of Lectures founded by lady Moyer; the object of which was, to defend the fundamental articles of the Christian faith; which were then attacked by men of great name, who obtained but too much encouragement from those in power. Accordingly Dr. Waterland delivered eight Sermons in St. Paul's cathedral, in defence of the Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, which were printed in 1720, with a long preface, in answer to two pamphlets written against his Vindication.

These works brought the author into a controversy with Dr. Clarke, and others on the Arian side, in which the former appeared to great advantage, as is admitted even by Dr. Clarke's biographer and admirer Bishop Hoadley, who is constrained to say of the Orthodox Vindicator, that "he was very skilful in the management of a debate, and very learned, and well versed in the writings of the ancient fathers." This acknowledgment is cool enough; but every candid reader of the productions on both sides, will see that there was much more in Dr. Waterland than what the friend of his antagonist allows him.

His "skill in debate" was in fact a keen and powerful judgment, which saw through the whole point at issue, and thoroughly weighed all the arguments adduced against the Catholic faith. To his great learning and intimacy with the writings of the ancient fathers, should have been added a faithful exhibition of their testimonies, and what is of superior importance in such a concern, a familiar acquaintance with ecclesiastical history, and a deep knowledge of the Holy Scriptures.

In 1721 Dr. Waterland published his famous tract, intituled "The Case of the Arian Subscription considered, and the several pleas and excuses for it particularly examined and confuted."

This pamphlet occasioned no small stir among the Arian party, especially those who were already in possession of good preferments, or who were looking eagerly for more. Dr. Sykes, who was at least as much an Arian as Dr. Clarke, published, but anonymously, a tract, intituled "The Case of Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles considered;" in which he laboured to vindicate the conduct of himself and those of his party, on the ground that the articles of our Church, so far as concerns the doctrine of the Trinity, are general, indefinite and indeterminate; and that there is no impropriety or absurdity in our using what we may wish to see corrected.

This miserable apology for the worst of all fraud and chicanery, called Dr. Waterland again into the field, and he accordingly determined this controversy on the side of truth and consistency, in "a Supplement to the Case of Arian Subscription considered." 8vo. 1722.

The same year he published "A Second Vindication of Christ's Divinity;" a "Sermon on the Doctrine of the Holy Trinity;" and a "Thanksgiving Sermon preached before the Lord Mayor."

In the preceding year he was presented by the Dean and Chapter of St. Paul's, to the rectory of St. Austin and St. Faith, in London; and by Archbishop Dawes, to the chancellorship of the church of York. In 1724 he published his "Critical History of the Athanasian Creed;" of which there have been two editions; a "Farther Vindication of Christ's Divinity," in answer to the Observations on the second defence of some Queries; "Remarks on Dr. Clarke's Exposition of the Catechism;" "A Defence of the Bishop of St. David's in answer to Jonathan



Jones;" and "The Nature, Obligation, and Efficacy of the Christian Sacraments." To this valuable tract he added a Supplement in 1730.

In 1727 Dr. Waterland was collated by Bishop Gibson to the archdeaconry of Middlesex, and about the same time he obtained a canonry in the church of Windsor, by the Chapter of which he was presented to the vicarage of Twickenham. On receiving this preferment, he resigned the rectory of St. Austin, not being willing to hold two benefices at once with the cure of souls.

When Tindal published his insidious attack upon Revelation, under the curious title of "Christianity as old as the Creation," Dr. Waterland published, but without his name, "Scripture Vindicated, in answer to Christianity as old as the Creation, part the first." Though this tract was anonymous, and could only be attributed to the real author by conjecture and report, it drew from the splenetic pen of Middleton a very impertinent "Letter to Dr. Waterland, containing some Remarks on his Vindication of Scripture." There was a great want of decency in this conduct, as there is also of good manners in the letter itself, which is full of perversions of Scripture and of scurrility against the vindicator. Dr. Waterland did not condescend to repel this attack, but went on with his laudable work, which he completed in three parts; and to the third edition he prefixed a general preface, giving an account of the literal, figurative, and mystical Interpretation of the Scripture.

This letter of Middleton, however, was animadverted upon by Dr. Pearce, afterwards successively Bishop of Bangor and Rochester, in "A Reply to the Letter to Dr. Waterland, setting forth the many Falshoods both in the Quotations and the Historical Facts: by which the Letter-Writer endeavours to weaken the authority of Moses." After pointing out the impropriety of publishing an anonymous address to Dr. Waterland, directly attributing to him what he had not publicly avowed, the author of the Reply makes this just observation: "But the Doctor's character as a learned and rational advocate for Christianity, was to feel the weight of your wit and reading; he had done too much good not to receive ill at the hands of the favourers of infidelity." This Reply soon reached a second edition, but twelve months elapsed before Middleton published "A De-



fence of his Letter," in which he treats his adversary with sufficient contempt. Pearce quickly brought out "A Reply to the Defence," and Middleton rejoined, which closed the controversy.

In 1731 Dr. Waterland printed the Charge delivered at his primary visitation; and the year following appeared his elaborate treatise "On the Importance of the Holy Trinity." In 1735 he published the substance of two Visitation Charges, in a "Discourse on Fundamentals."

On the publication of Hoadley's "Plain Account of the Nature and end of the Lord's Supper," Dr. Waterland took occasion to oppose the erroneous principles of it, in "A Charge on the Doctrinal Use of the Christian Sacraments;" which was followed by "A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist," and two more Charges on the same important subject.

This great man continued his exertions in the defence of truth, to the very last year of his life; for in 1740 he published that excellent "Discourse on Regeneration," which was the substance of two sermons preached at Windsor, and which has been lately reprinted in the first volume of that valuable collection "The Churchman's Remembrancer." The same year Dr. Waterland printed "A Charge on the Distinctions of Sacrifice," and a preface to the Sermons of Mr. Blair, commissary of Virginia. It may justly excite surprize that so bright an ornament of the Church of England, and so powerful a champion of Orthodox Christianity, did not obtain from the crown any higher dignity than a canonry of Windsor. Perhaps it is to the very zeal which he displayed that this neglect is to be attributed; since it is certain that many of those who openly maintained the errors which Dr. Waterland so successfully opposed, were, notwithstanding their principles, elevated to the first places in the Church; and even Dr. Clarke himself is said to have had the offer of a Bishopric. From a letter of the excellent Bishop Benson to his good friend Bishop Berkeley, it appears that Dr. Waterland was mentioned as the successor to Bishop Harris in the see of Landaff, in 1738, but superior interest prevailed in favour of Dr. Mawson.

This excellent divine died at Windsor in December, 1740, and his remains were interred in the collegiate Church at that place.

The character of Dr. Waterland, drawn by his friend and assistant Mr. Seed, in the funeral sermon preached at Twickenham, is so elegant, and does so much justice to the subject, that it could not with propriety be omitted in this memoir.

"Nobody," says he, "was more capable of shining as an original writer; and striking out new and unbeaten tracts of thought; for he had Mr. Locke's clearness of reasoning, as well as the extensive reading of Bishop Stillingfleet. He had pushed his inquiries so far into matters of a very high and elevated nature, that where his views stopped short, there was not merely the boundary of his understanding; it was the boundary of human understanding, the point where knowledge ceases and ignorance commences. An elaborate attempt had been made to demonstrate the existence of God *a priori*, and that he is the substratum of space. And when the strong man, well armed with learning and abilities, kept his new erected metaphysical building, his intellectual goods were at peace, just so long, till a stronger than he arose and stript him of his armour wherein he trusted.\* He had thoroughly studied the doctrine of the Trinity long before he entered into the controversy. He sat down to the subject without any preconceived darling hypothesis of his own, advanced in print, about the nature and attributes of God, which might tempt him to adjust the Scripture doctrine of the Trinity as well as he could, to it, by far-fetched criticisms and elaborate comments: he viewed it without any bias in the several lights of Scripture, reason and antiquity: he read, he weighed in the balance whatever had been said against it as well as for it: he conversed upon that subject with the ablest advocate that Arianism ever boasted, and corresponded with another considerable writer on that side of the question. His determination was not owing to any sudden heat of fancy; it was the mature result of thorough, honest, and unwearied examination; during which, through too close an application, he greatly impaired his health, and laid the foundation of that ill habit of body, which at last occasioned his death. How he was, in a manner forced into the controversy

\* The substance of what he wrote on this subject was communicated to the public by Dr. Law, master of Peterhouse, and afterwards Bishop of Carlisle, partly in his notes on King's Origin of Evil, and partly in his Enquiry into the Ideas of Space, &c. To which is added a Dissertation on the Argument *a priori*, by a learned hand, viz. Dr. Waterland.

by a person's committing his *Queries* to the press without his consent or even knowledge, he has given the world an account in the preface of the first of those excellent tracts, as the late Earl of Nottingham justly styles them, which he wrote on that subject.\* Whereas his adversaries laid the main stress of their cause upon philosophical subtleties and objections; particularly that there was no medium for the Catholics between Sabellianism and Tritheism; he disarmed them of their metaphysical artillery, turned it upon them, and made them seem willing to put the issue of their cause solely on the foot of scripture. And let me observe, with what an ill grace mere smatterers in knowledge charge the doctrine of the Trinity with absurdities from the abstract nature and reason of the thing; when three persons of distinguished abilities (for with three he was at once engaged) were unable, though they did not want an hearty inclination, to make good a charge of that nature.

“Arguments under his happy direction and management were arrows (of which his quiver was full) in the hands of a mighty man; they carried greater force with them, and made deeper impressions, than when they came from a person of the common size; and therefore he was not ashamed when he spoke with his ablest adversary in set conferences.† His head was an immense library, where the treasures of learning were ranged in such exact order, that whatever himself or his friends wanted, he could have immediate recourse to, without any embarrassment. A prodigious expanse of reading, without a confusion of ideas, is almost the peculiar characteristic of his writings. His works, particularly those upon our Saviour's Divinity, and the importance of the doctrine of the Eucharist, into which he has digested the learning of all preceding ages, will, we may venture to say, be transmitted to, and stand the examination of all succeeding ones. He has so thoroughly exhausted every subject that he wrote a set treatise upon, that it is impossible to hit upon any thing that is not in his writings, or to express that more clearly

\* See his answer to Mr. Whiston, p. 19, where he calls upon him, or any man else, to give a just answer to the excellent tracts written by Dr. Waterland in vindication of Christ's Divinity.

† Some conferences were proposed and held between him and his learned antagonist, before a very great and illustrious person; but those conferences were dropt after the Doctor declared his full conviction of the truth and importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and his resolution to maintain it.



which is there. Yet whatever expense of time or thought he might be at in laying in materials, it did not cost him much pains to commit them to writing. The largest volume\* which he has published, wrote with great accuracy, he in two months finished and sent to the press. Some writers who have made no inconsiderable figure in the learned world, have been greatly indebted for it to the valuable notices and observations with which he furnished them. But he was so disinterested, that provided the world was instructed, he was very indifferent who had the honour of doing it. He had so ample a fund of knowledge, that he could impart it liberally, without any danger of impoverishing himself.

“Nor was controversy his only talent. His sermons, adapted to the level of common capacities, yet instructive to the highest, were composed with that plainness and simplicity, that persons of a slender share of sense might be vain enough to think themselves capable of writing as well: but men of judgment know that nothing is more difficult to write than such easy writing as his was. Free from that obscure diligence which sometimes embarrasses the writings of great scholars, he states each point of duty judiciously and accurately, explains it happily, and always goes to the bottom of his subject. This character may be given of his writings in general, that whatever beauties of style some few of his last compositions may want, they have all of them that recommend them, which is more valuable than all languages besides, the language of the heart. In his learned writings he asserted nothing but what he firmly believed, and in his plain familiar discourses he taught nothing but what he practised. He spoke and wrote with that undissembled freedom and openness which ever accompany an undesigning honesty, and a thorough conviction of the truth; which brings me secondly, to give some account of his life and conversation. His head and heart were constantly at work upon points worthy of him; and yet, if any company came in, he would be immediately free and disengaged, forget the hard student in the easy companion, listen to any innocent conversation without any seeming absence of thought, and join in it with vivacity. I mention it as an amazing instance of the liberty and extent of his mind, that a

\* The second Defence of his Queries.

person generally intent (too intent with regard to his health) upon great things, could at once, with a quick and sudden transition of thought, enter into the minute affairs and ordinary occurrences of life. But though he could bear a part in any innocent discourse, he had an aversion to the reigning vices of conversation: he was very tender of men's characters; he guided his words, as well as regulated his actions, with discretion; and at the same time that his sagacity enabled him to discover, his charity prompted him to cover and conceal a multitude of faults. The conversation in which he chiefly delighted, was with learned men who came to consult him; in which, instead of fetching a wide compass round about a meaning, he entered at once into the heart of a question, with that quickness of apprehension and perspicuity of expression, which were confessed parts of his character. He saw at one glance where the main stress of it lay, omitted no material difficulties, and dwelt upon none but what were such; would not divert into by-points, but pared off all excrescence, and never lost sight of the main point till he dismissed you thoroughly satisfied about the question, and what was indeed unquestionable, his own great abilities; he struck light into perplexed and uncommon subjects, and placed even common ones in a clearer and more advantageous point of view. He had an excellent turn for business; for his clearness of reasoning was not confined to learned subjects; it extended almost to all. He could talk and write upon things quite foreign to the common tract of his studies, with such penetration, that one would imagine the main bent of them had been applied that way. Some of his acquaintance are living witnesses of this, who have consulted him, and received satisfaction from him upon very intricate affairs, which had no connection with or relation to divinity. Yet his grand abilities were so endeared by his humanity, affability, and condescension, that none, I believe, ever wished them less, but those who were embarked in a way of thinking essentially opposite to his.

“ His knowledge entirely filled, and therefore did not swell or puff up his mind. The brightness of some people is, like that of lightning, an insufferable brightness: his shone upon you with healing in its wings, a gentle, serene, and unoffending lustre. For though at a distance you might admire and reverence the great man, yet upon a more intimate acquaintance,

you could not help loving what you plainly saw, the good man; the man of cool wisdom and steady piety; fixed in his principles, but candid in his spirit. It is the interest of mere pretenders to knowledge and greatness, to affect a mysterious gravity, and to keep their inferiors at a distance: the idol is not to be seen unveiled, or in a full and open light by its votaries, lest they should discover its deformity.

“ Dr. Waterland was always easy of access, his carriage free and familiar, his heart, and his countenance the index of his heart, was always open to you, without a shy and reserved manner, without stateliness and solemnity; cautious, but not artful; honest, but not unguarded; glad to communicate, though not ambitious to display his great knowledge. He was substantially good, without studying appearances. He hated all party as such, and would never have gone the lengths of any. He never made a sacrifice of true greatness, through an eager pursuit of what the world call such. The preferments which he had were bestowed upon him, without any application from himself, directly or indirectly. They were not the result of his solicitations, much less of base and unworthy compliances; they were the voluntary tribute of great and good men, for his services to Christianity in general, and the Church of England in particular. Nor must it be forgotten, that he might have been advanced much higher, by the recommendation and interest of that very excellent prelate, who, in the opinion of every true friend to the Church, deservedly filled the highest station in it.

“ He weighed a thing long, and considered it on every side, before he formed a resolution; but when once he had formed it, he was ever afterwards determined and unmoveable. He saw things truly, because he saw them coolly and dispassionately. He was not one of those narrow-spirited men, who confine all merit within their own pale: he thought candidly, and spoke advantageously of many who thought very differently from him. When any virulent pamphlet was wrote (as scarce any person had more wrote) against him, it did not discontent or ruffle his temper: he did not detest the author, as a malicious enemy; he pitied him, as an unhappy man. He had nothing violent in his nature; he abhorred all thoughts of persecution: cool and prudential measures entirely suited his



frame of mind. Those who entertain a different opinion of him were strangers to him. Controversy had not at all embittered, or set an edge upon his spirit. The meek and candid Christian was not lost in the disputer of this world. I never saw him in a different humour, no, not in his last illness; the same unaffected cheerfulness, the same evenness and sedateness, which was his distinguishing character, from the first commencement of our acquaintance to the last. Whatever painful operations were thought necessary, he submitted to them without reluctance, and underwent them with patience and resignation. He was very amiable in a domestic light. Though he felt great uneasiness, he gave none but what arose from a fellow-feeling of his sufferings; even then, humane and benevolent to all about him; but especially to her, with whom he had lived in an uninterrupted harmony for twenty-one years, bringing forth valuable things out of the good treasures of his head and heart, communicative of any thing that was good, he would have engrossed nothing to himself but his sufferings, which yet he could not engross; for every good-natured person that saw him, could not but suffer with a man, by whom and from whom they were sure to suffer nothing.

“The same sound principles from which he never swerved, and of which he never expressed the least diffidence, which he had unanswerably defended in his health, supported and invigorated his spirits during his sickness: and he died a little before his entrance on the fifty-eighth year of his age, with the same composure with which he lived; and is now gone to offer up to God a whole life laid out, or rather worn out in his service. For he was like a light in the sanctuary, that wastes and consumes itself in shining out before men, that they may glorify their Father which is in heaven. Never weary with well doing, he knew not what it was to be idle; the time never lay upon his hands, and therefore he was a stranger to the spleen, melancholy, and imaginary uneasinesses, which are often as vexatious as real ones: he was a remarkable instance, that hard study does not always sour a man's temper, though idleness most certainly does, the parent of fretfulness, peevishness, and an acrimony of spirit. In health he was always easy, because never idle; always employed in, but never incumbered with business. He resolved cases of conscience, he removed doubts

and scruples : his assistance was often asked, and never, I believe, refused, when any useful work was on foot.

“ What chiefly endeared him was, not that he had gained a complete victory over Arians and Socinians ; it was, that he had gained (a much nobler conquest) a conquest over himself. For his reason seemed to have got the better as much over his passions in matters of practice, as it had over his imagination in matters of belief.

“ I have now paid the debt of gratitude, which I owed to a great and good man of the clearest head I ever conversed with, and what is still more valuable, of an honest heart ; who never through weakness mistook, nor through fear deserted, nor through interest betrayed, the cause of religion. I shall always reckon it my greatest honour, that I am in a particular manner obliged to him, to whom the Christian world in general is obliged for his excellent works ; whom I revered as a father, to whom I had recourse as my guide, and who received me always with that genuine flow of good nature, and openness of soul, which distinguishes the friend.

“ It is a melancholy reflection, that whoever dares vigorously assert and steadfastly adhere to the doctrine of the Church of England, must expect to be branded with opprobrious terms, and decried as a bigot. It will be of little avail to him, that his abilities are uncommon ; his notions must be so too, to recommend them to the vogue of the age. As if some men were not as liable to a fond attachment (or, what is the same thing, bigotry) to their own singular notions, sometimes the result of pride and vanity, as others are to the received fundamental doctrines of a Protestant Church, which have stood the test of ages, ever attacked, and ever triumphant. Our own particular darling tenets, by which we stand distinguished from the bulk of Christians, we look upon as our private enclosures, our private walks, in which we have a property exclusive of others, and which we take care to cultivate, beautify, and fence in against all invaders : the received notions, however important, we are more indifferent to, as the common field or public walks, which lie open to every body. At such a juncture, it cannot be improper, however unfashionable it may be, to bear my testimony to the merit of a man who dared to think deeply and thoroughly for himself ; though he did not think by himself.

And give me leave to conclude his character, by observing, that a man must have had an exceeding good, or an exceeding bad head and heart, who could converse oft and long with him, without becoming wiser as to the former, and better as to the latter.

“He is now far above, as indeed he was in his life, the reach of the inveterate malice of little writers; and he needs not our praises; he has received that praise which is infinitely more valuable than the united commendations of all created beings, the invaluable praise of his great Creator: ‘Well done, thou good and faithful servant; enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.’ It is not in our power to defend Christianity as he did, by unanswerable writings; but it is in our power, and should be in our inclination, to adorn it as he did, likewise by our lives and conversation.”

In 1742 were published, two volumes of Practical Sermons, by Dr. Waterland, and it is to be regretted, that a complete uniform edition of his entire Works, with a Memoir and Portrait of the learned and pious writer, has never yet appeared.

---

## RELIGIOUS MEDITATIONS.

(Continued from p. 96.)

No. XXVI.

### THE NATURE OF CHARITY.

1 Cor. xiii. 1.—*Though I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, and have not CHARITY, I am become as sounding brass, or a tinkling cymbal. And though I have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge; and though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. And though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.—CHARITY suffereth long, and is kind; charity envieth not; charity vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up; doth not behave*



*itself unseemly, seeketh not her own, is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil; rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.*

## MEDITATION.

**BY** this I learn that the possession of the excellent virtue of CHARITY doth not depend on *this world's goods*, nor yet on *talent or learning*;—but on the nature and *Christian temper of the mind*. A man may speak with the tongues of men and angels, and yet not have charity; he may have the gift of prophecy, and understand all mysteries, and all knowledge, and yet not have charity;—he may possess great riches, and bestow them all to feed the poor, and yet want the blessed gift of charity. Let me then, however humble my condition, and however limited my means of life may be, endeavour *to be in charity with all men*; and so to attain that CHARITY, which is the most excellent of all the Christian virtues. Let me cultivate that temper of mind which is not easily provoked, thinketh no evil, rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth; which doth not envy, doth not boast itself, is not puffed up with pride; but is kind and affectionate to all its fellow creatures.—So may I possess that CHARITY, without which all our doings are nothing worth! So may be poured into my heart that most excellent gift, which is the very bond of peace, and of all virtue! So may I enjoy its influence to my temporal comfort here, and to my eternal consolation hereafter! So when CHRIST, who is our life, shall appear, I may also appear with him in glory.

## No. XXVII.

## THE LORD'S SUPPER.

St. Luke xxii. 14.—*And when the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve Apostles with him. And HE said unto them, 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not any more eat thereof, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.'*—And

HE took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, 'Take this, and divide it among yourselves; for I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God shall come.' And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake it, and gave unto them, saying, 'This is my body which is given for you: THIS DO, IN REMEMBRANCE OF ME.' Likewise also the cup, after supper, saying, 'This cup is the NEW TESTAMENT IN MY BLOOD, which is shed for you.'

## MEDITATION.

These were the last commands of our SAVIOUR to his Apostles, before he was betrayed into the hands of wicked men, and before he suffered for the sins of all mankind. When I, a sinner, am redeemed by his death and sufferings, shall I not obey the dying command of my REDEEMER, *and do this in remembrance of him?*—Yes! I will take the cup of salvation, and call on the name of the Lord. This I will do, to show my sense of all his benefits. And when I approach the Sacramental Table with an honest and true heart, desiring to obey the commands of CHRIST, *and to show his death till he come*, let me not have any superstitious fears in respect thereof: knowing that when my LORD hath *made a feast*, and hath *commanded me to attend it*, in remembrance of his mercy to me, the *wilful disobedience* of absenting myself from his Supper, to which he hath invited me, will draw on me a greater and far more heavy punishment. Let me then truly and earnestly repent me of my sins,—purpose steadily to lead a new life—have a lively faith in GOD's mercy through CHRIST, with a thankful remembrance of his death,—and be in charity with all men.—So will I draw near with faith, and take this HOLY SACRAMENT to my comfort; and so shall this ceremonial act, DONE IN REMEMBRANCE OF CHRIST, be the means of amendment and Godly comfort here, and of my eternal happiness hereafter.

## No. XXVIII.

## THE CRUCIFIXION.

St. Mark xv. 33.—*And when the sixth hour was come, there was darkness over the whole land, until the ninth hour. And at the ninth hour JESUS cried with a loud voice, saying,*

Eloi, Eloi, lama sabachthani? *which is, being interpreted, 'MY GOD, MY GOD, WHY HAST THOU FORSAKEN ME?'* And some of them that stood by, when they heard it, said, '*Behold, he calleth Elias.*' And one ran, and filled a sponge full of vinegar; and put it on a reed, and gave him to drink, saying, '*Let alone; let us see whether Elias will come to take him down.*' And JESUS cried with a loud voice, and gave up the ghost. And the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom. And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, '*TRULY THIS MAN WAS THE SON OF GOD.*'

## MEDITATION.

OUR SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST was pleased to be born, and to live, in a low estate. Immediately on his birth, his life was sought after. His infancy was spent in distress and banishment; his youth in poverty. When he appeared as the TEACHER OF ISRAEL, mighty to save,—when he went about doing good, 'he had not where to lay his head.' When the time approached, that he should make atonement for the sins of mankind, all things conspired to embitter his death. One of his nearest friends betrayed him for thirty pieces of silver. The rest deserted him in his distress. Two of them, indeed, did afterwards follow him; but, of them, one followed—only to deny him.—Upon his trial, if he was silent, he was reproached with sullenness; if he spoke, he was charged with blasphemy.—He was buffeted,—spit upon,—crowned with thorns;—and when the question was put between HIM and a murderer, which should be released, 'he was despised and rejected of men.' They cried out with one voice, 'Release not him, but Barabbas.' When hanging on the cross between two robbers, groaning under the bitterest agonies of death, no pity was excited in the beholders. They shook their heads, and said, 'Come down from the cross, and we will believe in thee:—he saved others; himself he cannot save.' To this our LORD made no return, except by praying for their pardon in his dying moments:—'*FATHER! FORGIVE THEM; FOR THEY KNOW NOT WHAT THEY DO.*'—Such were the sufferings of the SON OF GOD! *Behold, and see if there was any sorrow like to*



*his sorrow!*—Shall I then, a sinful creature, murmur, and be discontented, because I am poor and in low estate? because I am despised, contemned, or injured? Oh no!—I will say with the Psalmist,—‘What reward shall I give unto the LORD, for all the benefits that he hath done unto me? I will take the *Cup of Salvation*, and call upon the name of the LORD.’ So shall the GOD of all grace, who hath called me to his eternal glory by CHRIST JESUS, *after that I have suffered awhile*, make me perfect, stablish, strengthen, settle me. To HIM be glory and dominion for ever and ever.\* AMEN.

## No. XXIX.

## THE ASCENSION.

St. Luke xxiv. 45.—*Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures; and said unto them, ‘Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day: and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name, among all nations, beginning at Jerusalem. And ye are witnesses of these things. And, behold, I send the promise of my FATHER upon you: but tarry ye in the city of Jerusalem, until ye be endued with power from on high.’—And he led them out as far as to Bethany; and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, WHILE HE BLESSED THEM, HE WAS PARTED FROM THEM, AND CARRIED UP INTO HEAVEN. And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy; and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing GOD. Amen.*

## MEDITATION.

THUS did OUR VICTORIOUS SAVIOUR ascend on high, and led captivity captive; triumphing over death and sin. The chariots of GOD which attended him were twenty thousand, even thousands of Angels.† Having ascended into Heaven, he is there seated on the right hand of GOD, ever to make intercession for us, his frail and imperfect creatures. Angels,

\* St. Peter v. 10.

† Psalm lxxviii. 17.

and authorities, and powers, are now made subject to him,\*—who left the bosom of his FATHER, and condescended to dwell in a tabernacle of flesh; in order *to die for our sins, and to rise again for our justification*. He hath told us that, if we love him and keep his commandments, he will pray the FATHER, and he shall give us ANOTHER COMFORTER, that he may abide with us for ever; even the SPIRIT OF TRUTH!† O that my heart may be duly impressed with the necessity of obeying the *commands* of CHRIST, in order to receive the *aid* and *consolation* of the HOLY SPIRIT. The fruits of the Spirit, we know, are such as are utterly incompatible with a wicked life. The fruits of the Spirit are *love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance*.‡—Through the operation of that HOLY SPIRIT may I have life in CHRIST, and at length receive the reward of my *faith*, in the *salvation of my soul*, through the merits and mediation of him my blessed REDEEMER. Amen, and Amen!

## No. XXX.

## ATONEMENT BY CHRIST.

Revelations v. 9.—*And they sung a new song, saying, 'THOU art worthy to take the book, and to open the seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to GOD by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and nation; and hast made us, unto OUR GOD, kings and priests: and we shall reign on the earth.'*—*And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, and the beasts, and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands;—saying, with a loud voice, 'WORTHY IS THE LAMB THAT WAS SLAIN, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.'* And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, 'Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto HIM that setteth upon the throne, and unto the LAMB for ever and ever.'

\* 1 Pet. iii. 22.

† John xiv. 15.

‡ Gal. v. 22.

MEDITATION.

JESUS CHRIST being become the HIGH PRIEST of good things to come, hath entered, once for all, into the Holy Place in Heaven. When he therefore yielded up his life on the Cross, he entered into heaven to offer his own blood for *my redemption*, and for that of all other sinners: and I know and believe, that he is able to save to the uttermost, every one who cometh unto GOD by him; seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for us.—The Holy Scripture saith that it is not possible for the blood of bulls and goats to take away sin; and that though in a sinful world and to fallen man, the *wages of sin is death*, and that without shedding of blood is no remission, yet it shall be my consolation, that the blood of CHRIST has been shed for me and for many, for the *remission of sins*.—By this sufficient and satisfactory *atonement*, GOD hath given us the victory over the great enemy of our salvation;—for he who died for us, had glory with the FATHER before the world began. By him were created all things that are in heaven, and that are on earth: and in him dwelleth *all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*. He is GOD over all, the LORD, which is, and which was, and which is to come: JESUS CHRIST, THE SAME YESTERDAY, AND TO-DAY, AND FOR EVER.\* Amen!

No. XXXI.

COMFORT IN OLD AGE.

St. Luke ii. 25.—*And, behold, there was a man in Jerusalem, whose name was Simeon; and the same man was just and devout, waiting for the consolation of Israel: and the HOLY GHOST was upon him. And it was revealed unto him by the HOLY GHOST, that he should not see death, before he had seen the LORD'S CHRIST. And he came by the SPIRIT into the Temple: and when the parents brought in the child JESUS, to do for him after the custom of the law; then took he him up in his arms, and blessed GOD, and said, 'LORD, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word:*

\* Heb. xiii. 8.



*for mine eyes have seen thy salvation; which thou hast prepared before the face of all people; a light to lighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people Israel.'—And there was one Anna, a prophetess, the daughter of Phanuel, of the tribe of Aser. She was of a great age, and had lived with an husband seven years from her virginity. And she was a widow of about fourscore and four years: which departed not from the temple, but served GOD with fasting and prayers, night and day. And she, coming in that instant, gave thanks likewise unto the LORD; and spake of him to all them that looked for redemption in Jerusalem.*

## MEDITATION.

How useful are these two examples of *pious old age*; devoting the close of their lives to prayer and praise in the temple, and looking for the consolation of Israel, and for the redemption of Jerusalem. May I endeavour to imitate the devout Simeon, and the pious Anna; and strive to make my life conformable to the law of GOD. So shall I *acquaint myself with him and be at peace!*\* So may I hope for acceptance, through the merits of my SAVIOUR!—When I look back on my past life, I may remember many errors, as well as many sorrows: but both are over and gone. I have truly repented of my sins, and I trust that the mercy of GOD will forgive them. If I can no longer perform the active duties of life, I can now more steadily devote the remainder of my days to GOD; and see with joy the approach of death, for death will bring me to my SAVIOUR's presence. The infirmities of advanced life are sent in mercy, to wean me from a world, which, with all its sorrows, we are still apt to love too well. The weakness of old age may enable me to look back without regret, and to look forward with hope and joy. So may I fix my desires and affections steadfastly on the eternal happiness of another world. So shall I be able, at the close of life, to exclaim with the holy apostle, 'I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the LORD, THE RIGHTEOUS JUDGE, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing.'<sup>†</sup>

\* Job xxii. 21.

† 2 Tim. iv. 7.

## No. XXXII.

## CONSOLATION IN DEATH.

1 Cor. xv. 20.—*But now is CHRIST risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead. For as in Adam all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive. But every man in his own order: CHRIST the first fruits; afterward they that are CHRIST's at his coming. Then cometh the end, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to GOD, even the FATHER; when he shall have put down all rule, and all authority and power. For he must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet. The last enemy that shall be destroyed is death. For he hath put all things under his feet. But when he saith, all things are put under him, it is manifest that HE is excepted, which did put all things under him. And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the SON also himself be subject unto him that put all things under him, that GOD may be all in all.*

## MEDITATION.

TO CHRIST, our REDEEMER, hath his ALMIGHTY FATHER given a name above every name; that at the name of JESUS every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that JESUS CHRIST is LORD.\*—He is indeed able to save to the uttermost, all that come by him unto GOD. Oh may I then listen to the voice of mercy, while it yet speaks: may I bend the stubborn knee, and bow down the hardened heart, ere my time of trial be past. So shall I be of that blessed number, which die in the Lord. So shall death be swallowed up in victory,—and I be admitted to the *Resurrection of eternal Life*; there to enjoy those abodes of bliss, those ineffable manifestations of divine power, and wisdom, and love. So shall I view those innumerable hosts of angels, and those my bre-

\* Philip ii. 9.

thence according to the flesh, the justified children of our father Adam, *Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles*, of every tongue, and people, and nation. So shall I behold CHRIST the REDEEMER of all,—the SAVIOUR, who died to atone for me, who arose to justify me, and hath ascended into heaven, and is now the LORD AND KING OF THE UNIVERSE. So shall I behold the THRONE OF GOD.—To search out these wonders, to share this blessedness (if I do in this life faithfully love and serve my GOD and my REDEEMER) shall be my employment and my bliss for ever.

## No. XXXIII.

## SALVATION THROUGH CHRIST.

Heb. ix. 11.—*But CHRIST being come AN HIGH PRIEST of good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle; not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, having obtained ETERNAL REDEMPTION for us. For if the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of an heifer sprinkling the unclean sanctifieth to the purifying of the flesh; how much more shall the blood of CHRIST, who through the ETERNAL SPIRIT offered himself without spot to GOD, purge your conscience from dead works to serve the LIVING GOD? And for this cause HE IS THE MEDIATOR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT; that by means of death, for the redemption of the transgressions that were under the first testament, they which are called might receive the promise of eternal inheritance.*

## MEDITATION.

There is one GOD; and one MEDIATOR between God and men, the man CHRIST JESUS; who gave himself a ransom for all.\* To JESUS, therefore, the author and finisher of our faith, the Mediator of the new Covenant, the Saviour and Redeemer of the World, let me address myself with an humble and penitent heart, not trusting in my own righteousness, but in his

\* 1 Tim. ii. 5.



manifold and great mercies. 'If we say we have no sin, we deceive ourselves.' *All have sinned*; all flesh is corrupt before GOD; and it is impossible, that by our own strength we can attain unto holiness. But OUR GRACIOUS GOD does not require what we are unable to perform. He pities our weakness; and he accepts every sincere though imperfect endeavour, through the merits and mediation of CHRIST. On that SAVIOUR may my hopes be fixed; and may I diligently study the commandments which he hath left me in the New Testament. May I believe what is there revealed, and practise what is there taught; and having used my best endeavours to know his will, and humbly to perform it, let me cast all my *care on him*, who hath promised the sincere penitent the consolation of his HOLY SPIRIT to guide him into all truth\* here, and to bestow on him a crown of eternal glory hereafter. Now to HIM who loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, be glory and adoration for ever. Amen!

## No. XXXIV.

## THE BURIAL SERVICE.

St. John xi. 25. Job xix. 25. 1 Cor. xv. 53.—*I am the RESURRECTION and the LIFE. He that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live. And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die. I KNOW that my REDEEMER liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth. And though after my skin, worms destroy this body; yet, in my flesh, shall I see GOD. Whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another; though my reins be consumed within me.—This corruptible must put on incorruption; and this mortal must put on immortality. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory.—O death! where is thy sting? O grave! where is thy victory?*

\* St. John xvi. 13.

## MEDITATION.

I have heard these portions of Scripture read at the burial of my deceased relations and friends. Within a short period they will be read over me. So is the interment of the dead made a source of edification to the living. When my heart is softened by affliction,—when I attend the remains of my departed friend to the grave, I am made sensible of the speedy and inevitable end of all earthly possessions and enjoyments.—I am taught to look to CHRIST, THE REDEEMER, THE RESURRECTION, AND THE LIFE; in whom, whosoever believeth, though he were dead, yet shall he live. I am taught that the souls of the faithful, after they are delivered from the burthen of the flesh, are with CHRIST, in joy and felicity.—I am taught that, though earth be committed to earth, ashes to ashes, dust to dust; yet it is in the sure and certain hope of the *Resurrection* of the just to eternal life, through our LORD JESUS CHRIST; who shall change my vile body, that it may be like unto his glorious body.—Let me, therefore, press forward with earnestness and diligence to the mark, for the prize of the high calling of GOD in CHRIST JESUS;—that so when I quit this mortal life, I may hear those joyful words, ‘WELL DONE, GOOD AND FAITHFUL SERVANT! ENTER THOU INTO THE JOY OF THY LORD!’

(*To be continued.*)

---

*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

## EPISCOPACY VINDICATED:

*In a Series of Letters to the Rev. Dr. MILLER, by the Rev. JAMES KEMP, D. D. Rector of Great Choptank Parish, Dorchester County, Maryland.*

## LETTER V.

(Continued from p. 135.)

THE testimony of *Hilary* the Deacon, I cannot admit to be of any value. His opinions respecting the primitive organization of the Church are vague and incoherent. But even if his

authority were respectable, the case of the Churches in Egypt seems evidently to be considered as an exception. And at some times he is clearly Episcopal. "Though every Bishop be a Presbyter, yet every Presbyter is not a Bishop."

St. Chrysostom. "The Apostles," says he, "having discoursed concerning the Bishops, and described them, declaring what they ought to be, and from what they ought to abstain, omitting the order of *Presbyters*, descends to the *Deacons*; and why so, but because between Bishop and Presbyter there is scarcely any difference; and to them is committed both the *instruction* and the *Presidency* of the Church; and whatever he said of *Bishops*, agrees also to *Presbyters*. In *ordination alone* they have *gone beyond* the *Presbyters*." This last sentence you have brought nearer to your purpose than, I think, the words of the Father will admit. Τη γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ ὑπερβήκασι, καὶ τῷ μόνῳ δοκῶσι πλεονεκτήν τῆς πρεσβυτερίας. *For in ordination alone they have gone above the Presbyters, and in this they seem only to be superior to Presbyters.* This surely has a more evident reference to superiority of rank, than your translation. This, however, is a much less material deviation from the author, than in your note upon St. Jerome. Fearing it would seem that you had not made him sufficiently explicit, by detaching a sentence connected with the foregoing paragraph by the particle *enim*, *for*, and translating that sentence as if the word *nunc*, *now*, had been in it, you go still farther, and make him say, "that the only right which Bishops had *gained* over Presbyters *in his day*, was that of ordination." *Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, Episcopus, quod Presbyter non faciat.*" This really, Sir, is calculated to induce a belief, that your cause will require a new translation of the Fathers before it stand secure.

Your quotations from Theodoret, Primasius, and Sedulius, I shall omit, as they only go to prove what Episcopalians never deny, that Bishop and Presbyter are indiscriminately used in the New Testament for the same order. I cannot, however, acquit you of keeping out of view clear and explicit testimony on our side. The continuation of your quotation from Theodoret I look upon to be of this description. "Anciently the same persons were styled Presbyters and Bishops, the name Apostles being then given to them who are now called Bishops; but in process of time, they left the name of Apostle to them



who were Apostles indeed, and gave this name of Bishop peculiarly to them who were anciently styled Apostles." *Com.* on 1 Tim. iii.

The case of *Aerius* I admit to be as you have stated it. "He was condemned, not so much for maintaining that Bishop and Presbyter were the same by the word of God, as for insisting that there ought not to be any difference made between them." P. 193. His offence consisted in maintaining, that the Bishops, who, as Theodoret says, were in the place of the Apostles, were not superior to Presbyters. Jerome and Augustin held no such doctrine. They never questioned the superiority of Bishops; they never claimed at least the right of ordination for Presbyters.\*

Eusebius is the next witness on whose testimony you say Episcopalians lay much stress; and, for my part, I think them entirely correct for so doing. For, not to descend to particulars, I will appeal to any man of candour, whether an honest and enlightened historian would have written the history of the Church in the manner in which he has, if your doctrine of *parity* had then prevailed? Should we not have found some mention or some allusion to such a system of government—sometimes a distinction between ruling and preaching Elders—something clearly distinguishing lay Elders and lay Deacons from Clergymen? The truth is, Eusebius comes altogether to the Episcopalian position, fixing scripture together with early writers as the ground of our doctrine. We believe, that the Apostles, after they had appointed the two inferior orders in the ministry, ordained successors of themselves. Eusebius confirms this by tracing these successors in some of the principal cities. We believe that Presbyters and Deacons were ordained by and under the control of Bishops. Eusebius shows us that each Bishop had a number of these inferior Clergy under his care.

\* Dr. Hawies, I hold to be no authority with Episcopalians. It is true, he possesses the orders of the Church and enjoys a rich Rectory in England. But, although he has styled his history impartial, I am well satisfied that there is not a more partial one extant. And what is worse, after a display of extraordinary sanctity, he seems to omit no occasion to inflict a wound on that communion to which he belongs, in all the petulance of a captious fanatic. I should have supposed, that you would have been cautious in quoting Hawies, lest it might be believed that you were not disposed to treat Episcopalians fairly.

If it be admitted that Eusebius wrote a good and faithful history from the materials that he possessed, which is certainly the general opinion of the learned, it must seem wonderful beyond belief, that if so material a change took place in the government of the Church as you contend for, there should not one single trace of it be found in his history. We find Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons recognized from the beginning without a single mark of change or notice of innovation. And if in the first century, or indeed later, Bishops were mere Presbyters, without distinction of order or superiority of powers; and if in the third or fourth century they were a distinct order, and possessed superior powers, where is the decree, where is the canon, nay, where is the allusion to such a change? A period embracing such a change, the history of which was written by one historian, would surely have exhibited a vast contrast between the government of the Church at one time from what it was at another; and yet no such change is marked by Eusebius. As the number of Christians increased, or their condition was depressed or prosperous, the dioceses of Bishops may have varied in their size or in the number of their members; but through the whole history we find Bishops distinguished from Presbyters in the same manner, and bearing the same relation to one another.

You are equally unfortunate in quoting Milton as you were in Hawies. Had you appealed to his judgment in poetry, we should most readily have concurred; but it can hardly be unknown to you, how bitter his antipathy against the Church was. "His zeal against the Church is said to have been *distempered* and *furious*; that although in other things he was great and learned, as to religion and politics, he could not even mention them with calmness and temper."

In addition to the testimony of the Fathers, it seems there are "some facts incidentally stated by early writers," which also answer your purpose. These shall now be examined.

1. The first is, the great number of Bishops said to be in no small districts of country. In proof of this, you adduce the council of Antioch, held for the trial of Paul, Bishop of that city. I find no definite number mentioned by Eusebius; but after having named several, no doubt more distinguished than the rest, he adds, "I might have repeated infinite more, both



Ministers and Deacons, who met for the same cause." Lib. vii. chap. 27. Your other examples are so remote from your purpose, that it would almost seem that you had forgotten some of your own positions. You have stated that imparity appeared in the Church about the close of the second century; and still you quote instances of great numbers of Bishops in small districts as a proof of parochial Episcopacy, much later, nay, as far down as the beginning of the fifth century: Besides, I wonder that you did not perceive, that it was as easy to account for this, by supposing the dioceses to have been gradually enlarged, as the state of the Church altered; and this is at least a much more probable solution than yours: for the labours and duties of the Ministry decreased in every country, when Christianity had once become the fixed and permanent religion. And in the case of Ireland, if there was a Bishop for every district, as limited as modern parishes, what does that avail in the argument, when we are expressly told, that there were several Elders for every Bishop; and that these Elders were *ordained* Ministers? If there was a perfect *parity* among the ordained Ministers—if they were all Bishops, as you contend, the numbers that might have attended councils would have been immense.

2. Your *second fact* seems really of so little consequence, that it is rather calculated to betray the weakness of your cause. That the assembling of the *flock*, as you term it, for which the Bishop was to be ordained, should amount to a proof that that flock constituted only one congregation, is certainly at variance with the common principles of reasoning. To satisfy an impartial mind, and to authorize a certain conclusion, it would have been necessary to have stated several other circumstances; such as, whether all who attended on such occasions, were the ordinary congregation; whether so remarkable an event did not collect the members of several Churches, as is usual in modern times; and whether the common expressions, *in presence of the brethren—before the Church—before the multitude—with the consent of the Church*, &c. implied the presence of every individual, and his vote or implied assent.

3. Your *third fact*, "that for a considerable time after the days of the Apostles, all the Elders who were connected with a Bishop, are represented as belonging to the same congrega-



tion with him, and sitting with him when the congregation was convened for public worship." That there were always several Elders connected with a Bishop is readily admitted. But that a Bishop with several Elders were attached to single congregations is no where asserted, nor, indeed, even intimated; nay, such an arrangement would have required a number of Bishops in all the principal cities where Christianity prevailed. Whereas, we are expressly told, that in these cities there never were more than one Bishop at a time.

4. Your *fourth fact*, "that the Bishop lived in the same house with his Presbyters," militates strongly against your doctrine. It amounts, at least, to a presumption, that the Elders were Clergymen; and surely it implies no proof that they were confined to one congregation. Bishop Carrol, of Baltimore, lives in the same house with some of his Presbyters, and his house adjoins a chapel. *Ergo*: by Dr. Miller's reasoning, Bishop Carrol is a *parochial* Bishop.

The *last* circumstance upon which you rely to prove the primitive Bishop to be the Pastor of a single congregation, "is the nature of the service which he was accustomed to perform." Here you have introduced "your Bishop" performing, in general, all the baptisms in his flock—the only person who, in ordinary cases, administered the Lord's supper, as visiting all the sick under his care, celebrating all marriages, attending all funerals, and personally acquainted with every individual of his flock, &c. In every one of these particulars we have proved you to be mistaken. We have shown positive and explicit declarations of the most eminent early Fathers, whose testimony is not to be suspected, that Presbyters baptized and administered the holy Eucharist. We have shown your proof of the other particulars to be entirely unsatisfactory. But we must still go farther, and point out even certain districts of country, in addition to large cities that were under the superintendence of a single Bishop, and assigned to the care and ministry of several Presbyters. The region of Mareotis and all the churches in it belonged to the Bishop of Alexandria alone. His Presbyters had their several portions of it, and each of them ten or more large villages under his particular care.\* Whoever, then,

\* Slater's Draught of the Primitive Church, p. 60:

can believe that the primitive Bishops had only one single congregation each, I think we must admit to have acquired the capacity of believing any thing.

As to Ruling Elders, I did believe, with *Stillfleet*, that we had entirely lost them. A single text of scripture, variously interpreted by Presbyterians themselves, seems authority enough for you to make a distinction among Presbyters, when no such distinction is mentioned through the writings of the Fathers. And now, to clothe this with some semblance of propriety, you adduce works and authorities on which no confidence has been placed. How could all the venerable early Fathers overlook this distinction? How could the Church exist so long without the agency of Ruling Elders? It is true, you resort to Cyprian on this point, and his authority we admit. But we can only admit Cyprian's doctrine, and Cyprian's meaning. And the case of Numidicus is by no means to the point, until dressed up in your language. Is he any where called a Ruling or Lay Elder? Or was this the stated line of promotion in the Church? If it was, Presbyterians in modern times have surely deviated from it: for I find no rule by which to be a Lay Elder is a preliminary step towards being a Clerical one. Indeed, Sir, your proof of the existence of Lay Elders in the primitive Church is so slender and unsatisfactory, that I think you had better, with Dr. Campbell, yield up the point. "The distinction is too considerable between a Pastor and Lay Elder to be invariably confounded under one common name."\* May I not, then, in my turn, be permitted to exclaim, How numerous are the contradictions, and how wide the differences among men when they depart from primitive order—when they lose sight of divine *institution*, and adopt the plans of men!!

We have now examined the testimony of the later Fathers, and, for my own part, I must acknowledge, that my astonishment has greatly increased, when I find it *gravely* maintained, that these venerable ministers yield any countenance to the doctrine of *parity*. That there were three orders is a supposition absolutely necessary to render their *allusions* pertinent, even independent of their positive assertions. And I will ask any

\* Campbell's Ecclesiastical Lectures, vol. i. p. 179.

man to consult these Fathers attentively, and try if he can find a single *assertion*, nay, the most remote intimation, that prelacy, as it then existed, was a "*human invention*." (Page 209.) I would ask, when was the period? which was the country? who were the persons? what were the means by which this fundamental and entire change in the outward form of the visible Church was effected?

On the other hand, the Episcopal position I conceive to be fully substantiated. Beginning with the commission given by our blessed Lord, before his ascension, we find under that commission, during the period of divine inspiration, Apostles, Bishops or Presbyters, and Deacons. We see the Apostles, towards the close of their ministry, appointing successors, with the same authority over the inferior orders that they exercised. We have a regular succession of these superior ministers, in the cities and countries, when the gospel was first propagated, in Jerusalem, in Ephesus, in Antioch, in Rome, and in Alexandria. Even where the Christians amounted to many thousands, we find only one Bishop, with his Presbyters and Deacons; nor have we the slightest information that these were lay-officers; but clerical powers and clerical duties we find uniformly allotted to them.

Under the influence then of our principles, these things are a ground of irresistible obligation to adhere to such a form of polity, as the wisest and the best. For we believe government to be *essential* to the visible Church, and we can find no authority to substitute the suggestions of human prudence in place of divine appointments. Here we rest in peace, well assured that we are members of the spiritual kingdom of Christ upon earth; and that if we apply all its benefits, and all its blessings, to the improvement of our hearts, we shall be admitted finally into the Church triumphant.

*(To be continued.)*



[We invite the attention of our readers to the following treatise, It relates to some religious topics that are frequently, and with interest, discussed among Christians. Mr. Knox, the author, was a Presbyterian Minister, and resided for several years in this country, but afterwards removed to the West-Indies, and died on the island of St. Croix. In the following republication of his letter, the introduction, and some other sentences are omitted which were not essential to the argument; and a note to the introduction is incorporated with the letter.]

A Letter to the Rev. Mr. JACOB GREEN, of New-Jersey, pointing out some Difficulties in the Calvinistic Scheme of Divinity, respecting FREE WILL, DIVINE DECREES, PARTICULAR REDEMPTION, &c. and requesting a Solution of them. By HUGH KNOX, Minister of the Gospel in the Island of Saba, in the West-Indies.

[Continued from page 107.]

I WOULD now beg leave to speak a few words relative to the doctrine of *original sin*, at the freedom of which I hope you will take no offence; and the rather so, when I assure you that I shall *speak* rather *more freely* in this matter, than I *dare to think*; that I may procure solid solutions to some plausible objections against the orthodox mode of explaining it. Men have fallen in *Adam*: from him they have necessarily derived a corrupt nature.—Say what we will of *Adam's federal headship*, yet it seems impossible for us not to believe that this hereditary taint and corruption of nature, is more the *misfortune* than the *fault* of *Adam's* posterity. Men come into the world in these unhappy circumstances by no *personal* fault of theirs. It will not, I suppose, satisfy thinking men to say, “That God, in his moral government, found all mankind in a corrupt, guilty, miserable, perishing state; and that it is *sovereign mercy* in him to save some, and doing no *wrong* or *injustice* to leave others to perish in this state.”

The question will still recur, “How came mankind into this perishing state? Was it by their own personal fault? or, was it by the fault of one whom God chose to be their federal head

and representative, and who, he foresaw, would ill acquit himself in this department; and therefore by the *determination* and *disposal* of God himself?" It will scarce be thought sufficient to relieve this difficulty, to say, "that God best knew whom to choose as our federal head, and that none of *Adam's* posterity were more likely to keep the covenant than himself;" or, "that each of them would have certainly broken it in his own person." Besides that this is only *conjectural* and *inconclusive*, it will be deemed an imputation on the goodness of God for making such creatures in such circumstances, that no one of the race could be supposed capable of fulfilling the law of his creation: It will be farther said, that *all Adam's* posterity have never had the trial; and that, on supposition of their having had it, and abused it, they would have been then *properly*, that is, *personally* culpable, and the divine disposal might then have stood clear of any plausible impeachment. Nor will it be supposed to clear up the difficulty, to allege, "that sinners have as little reason to find fault with God's choosing the *first Adam*, and imputing his *guilt*, as with his choosing the *second*, and imputing his *righteousness*; and yet they never find fault with the latter, as repugnant to the ideas of justice and equity." The two cases are supposed to be widely different. *Mercy* may confer an undeserved favour on the guilty and miserable, without the imputation of *injustice*; yea, it is of its *very nature*, and its *glory*, to do so. Whereas it is thought utterly irreconcilable with our notions of *justice*, to suppose that God should so *order* and *determine* things, as that his creatures should be brought into circumstances of guilt and misery by the fault of *another*; and yet eternally punish them for this guilt, without putting it in their power, by a new state of trial and a dispensation of mercy, to recover at least their lost ground; to set them, as it were, where *Adam* first stood, or in an equally advantageous situation.—And if it seems impossible to reconcile this with our ideas of *justice*, how much more with those of *mercy*—and that strengthened by the principle of *universal benevolence*, which is most certainly essential to the idea of the blessed God.

According to the doctrine of *particular redemption*, as explained by all strictly Calvinistic writers, this idea of the divine justice, mercy and benevolence, can never be consistently held,

according to my apprehension of things. These writers begin with men as *lost*, but seem not anxiously to inquire or clearly to determine how they came to be so; or how far it concerns the righteous, merciful and benevolent God, to put them into a *salvable* state, or to give them a farther trial for their *lost inheritance*. Not that I think any of the fallen race of *Adam* have any claim to heaven, founded on any of the divine perfections:—But I imagine that the *justice, mercy and benevolence* of the divine nature entitle them, either to the privilege of an *extinction of being*, or to a chance for happiness equal to what innocent *Adam* had, and from which he fell, involving his posterity with him in a state of corruption and ruin: Thus, where sin hath abounded, there will grace *equally*, yea *much more* abound, by the *superior* privileges of the gospel.

Upon this, to me, seemingly clear principle of the divine benevolence, I am inclined to believe, that CHRIST has *repaired*, yea, *much more* than repaired, the ruins of the fall; and put all mankind in *as good*, yea, in much better and more favourable circumstances than ever *Adam* was in, even in his state of innocency.—I am induced to believe, upon the *same principle*, that no human infant will ever suffer eternal torments, on account of any *original sin* or *corruption* whatever; but that it will be, upon the whole, good for all of them, that they have been born;—*the free gift, by the righteousness of CHRIST, coming upon all of them, unto justification of life*.—I am inclined to believe, that no human creature shall ever finally perish, but by his *personal* and criminal abuse or misimprovement of *some state of trial*, by the *right use* of which he might have obtained some measure or degree of eternal happiness.—Through the mercy of GOD in CHRIST, I am induced to believe, that every human creature has it *some how or other* put into his power, to be *as happy* as *Adam* could have been by keeping the covenant of life, if not *much happier*.—And I am farther, on the same principles, induced to believe, that tenders of mercy and salvation in the gospel, are made to *all men*, without any *exception, limitation or reserve*, on the score of any *divine decree*, or any *election or non-election*; and that *all sinners* to whom the *joyful sound* reaches, by virtue of the *offer, promise, invitation, and merciful dispensation* of God, have it *properly*



put within the reach of their *power*, yea, and *will* too, to *accept* them, and be everlastingly happy.\*

\* \* \* \* \*

To sum up my sentiments on this head in a few words: I am inclined to believe that CHRIST, by dying for ALL, and purchasing the spirit for ALL, and putting ALL (absolutely the WHOLE GUILTY RACE) in a *salvable state*, has removed the MOUNTAIN of NATURAL INABILITY out of the way of ALL sinners: so that all who will continue in their revolt and apostacy, and refuse the *purchased, offered* salvation, shall be *properly* and highly culpable, *condemnable*, and *eternally punishable* for so doing, and shall appear to themselves and to the whole world, to deserve no pity in their everlasting torments.

Page 14th of your last letter you affirm, that till the moment of regeneration, there is nothing in the sinner that is *spiritually good*; nothing but the exertions of that carnal mind which is

\* Mr. Sandiman, in his letters on *Theron* and *Aspasio*, entering entirely into President Edwards's liberty of spontaneity, ridicules my notion of liberty as *unintelligible*. "No man, says he, could ever conceive a notion of liberty higher than what lies in *doing what we please*." But if we always do *what we please*, or, in other words, *act freely*, according to this notion of freedom, what comes of the apostle's assertion, "*to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good, I find not;—for the good that I would, I do not; but the evil that I would not, that I do*." Rom. vii. "*Ye cannot do the things that ye would*." Gal. v. It seems then that the apostle did not always the things that *he would*, or that *pleased him*; consequently that he did not *act freely* according to this *only conceivable* notion of human liberty—therefore was not a *moral, accountable agent* in any such actions.

Indeed, the celebrated declaration of *Medea* is so just, and agreeable to such abundant experience—*video meliora proboque, deteriora sequor*—that I see not how it can be disputed that men often act against their *ultimum practicum judicium*; that the soul has a power of exerting volitions, not only *independent on*, but even *contrary to*, the highest, best, and most apparent motives,—and that the connection between motives in the understanding and the exertions of the will, is not so strict as not to be often broken and grossly violated.

Mr. Sandiman, however shuffling and inconsistent in other matters, is nevertheless consistent with himself throughout in his notion of the *fatality of human volitions and actions*. He is ever just to this principle; so far as almost wholly to deny the propriety of *moral suasion*; of *calls, offers, invitations*, or other addresses to the *active and elective powers* of the human soul. He ridicules what he calls the *popular doctrine* on this account; and is only for *holding up the naked saving truth to the understanding*,—persuaded that the *elect* will believe and embrace it, and that others *cannot*. And while, in one of his *appendices*, he extols Mr. Edwards, as the most masterly and unanswerable writer on the side of, what I call, *necessity*, he blames him of *inconsistence* (I fear too deservedly) in falling into the tract of the *popular preachers* in the practical use of his principles. See Sand. lett. ed. 3. vol. i. p. 245. vol. ii. p. 284, &c.

enmity against God," &c. This I know is not a sentiment *peculiar* to yourself, but may be deemed properly *Calvinistic*, as it is held by most divines of that party. However, I have long doubted the truth of it, and am at a loss to know how it can consist with their doctrine of *common grace*, or what renders it necessary in that scheme of thinking; and much more wherein consists the danger of the contrary sentiment.

I readily grant that before an *effectual, saving change*, there can be no *fixed, uniform, permanent* principle of goodness. The necessity of conversion, in order to a life of true holiness *here*, and the complete enjoyment of God *hereafter*, is a truth so *clear* and *self-evident*, that if our Saviour had never said, "*Except a man be born again of the spirit and converted, he shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven*"—we might have inferred it from the principles of reason. No possibility of a *new life*, without a *new heart*, as the source of it. But I deem it inconsistent with the general tenor of scripture to suppose that sinners do nothing *formally* good, or agreeable to the mind of God, before regeneration and conversion. It is, I think, pretty universally believed by *Calvinists*, that there is such a thing as *common grace*, or a common operation of the spirit, influencing all sinners, more especially gospel sinners. It is allowed that God is thus striving *more or less* with all men, unless such as have out-sinned their day of grace. Nor, without admitting this, can I see how wicked men should be blamed in scripture, for *quenching, grieving* and *resisting* the spirit. If this be granted, and yet it be affirmed that unregenerate men do *never comply* with these common operations of the spirit, but *always resist* them; as *Steven* charges the *Jews*; "*Ye stiff-necked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye do ALWAYS resist the Holy Ghost; as your fathers did, so do ye;*" this needs proof. If the generality of the Jewish nation did, all might not. And if this was the character of the *Jews*, yet it may not be that of all sinners. It seems to have been the guilt of the *Jews* that they did *thus resist*, when they *might have complied*. Some of our most orthodox divines have not scrupled to suppose, that some of the finest heathen *characters* and *writings* are the *fruits* of such an influence. But *wherever* the holy spirit of God operates, and *so far* as he operates, his effects must be, like himself, *holy*; not only *materially*, but *formally*



so. The worst of men are allowed to have some *good* thoughts, desires, purposes and resolutions; and what can these be, but the immediate fruits and effects of this *holy agent*? For we are assured that all our sufficiency is of GOD; that he is the author of every good and every perfect gift; that, of ourselves, we cannot so much as *think a good thought*, and that *in us*, that is, in *our flesh*, or corrupt nature, *dwelleth no good thing*. If any are disposed, for the sake of a *hypothesis*, to deny the *formal goodness* of actions which seem to have all the apparent circumstances of being such, there can be no disputing with them, because there can be no way to convince them, as GOD only can certainly know the *temper, motives, aims, and designs* of the heart. But when an action *seems good*, charity would incline us to believe that *it is so*, until we see good reason to believe the contrary. Especially when GOD vouchsafes to *approve* an action, and to declare it *pleasing* and *acceptable* to him, I think we have sufficient reason to conclude, that such an action is *formally good*; even although it should be done by an unregenerate sinner. Was it not some good thing in wicked *Ahab*, to *humble himself* and *walk softly* before GOD? And did not GOD declare his approbation of such a conduct, by sparing the wicked king in consequence?—When the *Ninevites* repented at the preaching of *Jonah*, did they do nothing *formally good*—nothing *pleasing* and *acceptable* to GOD?—Did wicked *Nebuchadnezzar* do nothing *formally good*, when, convinced of his dependent state, he blessed the most High, and praised, honoured and extolled the King of heaven, in the noble and excellent manner recorded, Dan. iv. 34—37?

When our Lord looked upon the *young man* in the gospel, and *loved* him, can we suppose that he saw nothing in him morally good, which was a motive of his *love*? Is it to be imagined that CHRIST would express his love of one, in whom there was *nothing spiritually good, nothing but the exertions of that carnal mind which is enmity against GOD*? Yet we know that this youth was of *very imperfect character*; that his heart was not wholly right with GOD, and that a *good principle* did not *predominate* in him;—in other words, that he was not regenerated.—Did wicked *Herod* do nothing *formally good*, when he heard the *baptist* gladly, and did many things willingly in obedience to his ministry?—When CHRIST tells the *Jews*



that the same *John* was a burning and shining light, and that they were willing for a season to rejoice in his light, (John v.) can we suppose that this *temporary rejoicing in the light* had nothing formally good in it, so far as it went? Did it proceed from the *corrupt nature* and *carnal mind* of these *Jews*; or from the influences of the *good spirit* upon their affections?—When the *stony ground* hearers *heard the word*, and *with joy received it*, and *endured for a while*, may we not suppose that they did something *formally good* and *pleasing to God*; although their goodness was like the *morning cloud* and *early dew which passeth away*?—The cases put by the apostles, Heb. vi. 4—6. and 2 Pet. ii. 20—22, are generally supposed to be the cases of *unregenerate persons*; yet can we suppose that these persons never did any thing good, or from a right principle? It is hard to conceive that persons should be *enlightened* and *taste of the heavenly gift*, and be made *partakers of the Holy Ghost*, and *taste the good word of God*, and *the powers of the world to come*, and *have escaped the pollutions of the world through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ*; and yet, under all these impressions, exercises and discoveries, never have thought *one good thought*, formed *one good resolution*, or done *any one thing pleasing and acceptable to God*. I deem it trifling to put off the force of the evidence which these two passages afford in favour of the sentiment I espouse, by saying that these are only *hypothetical* cases put, which *can never happen in fact*. This is making a *nose of wax* of the scriptures with a witness. Nor is it treating the sacred oracles much more respectfully, to explain away these *strong* and *nervous* phrases to nothing, as though they imported nothing more than what happened to *Saul among the prophets*!—When a wicked man, in reading a chapter of the Bible, or hearing a moving sermon, is convicted of a sin, and humbled because of it; is not this a *good thought*, so far as it goes? Is it not *formally* so? And if this *shame*, *humility* and *remorse* should drive him to his knees in secret to ask God's pardon, with tears; is not this a *good action*? I am well aware of what may be said here concerning *natural conscience*; *mechanical movement of the affections*; *want of right principles*, &c. &c. but I cannot help thinking that all such convictions and penitential meltings under the *word of God*, are, in part at least, the fruits and ef-

fects of that dispensation of the spirit which attends a preached gospel; and that, in as far as they are so, they must be *spiritually good, pleasing and acceptable* to GOD.

You will say that this goodness is not *universal, uniform and persevering*, and therefore not that *goodness and righteousness* which the gospel requires. I grant it: but the question is, "Can an *unregenerate* sinner do *any thing* formally good or pleasing to GOD?"—You will say there is a mixture of imperfection in this kind of goodness, which has the nature of sin: and is there not the same in the *best works* of the *best saints*?—You will say this kind of goodness can merit nothing at the hand of GOD; can lay him under no kind of obligations to confer any favours on the subjects of it:—Nor, surely, can that of the most holy men upon earth; who are but unprofitable servants when they have done all that ever they shall be enabled to do, under the greatest advantages. In a word, I can see no evident reason for making any other essential difference between these two kinds of goodness than this; that whereas the one is *transient, partial, temporary, and unhabitual*; the other is *universal, uniform, habitual, prevailing, and persevering*, arising from the *indwelling and abiding* energy of the Holy Spirit, as a sanctifier.

And that men, even in a state of unregeneracy, may be *better or worse; farther from, or nearer to*, a right temper; *more or less* pleasing and acceptable to GOD; or rather, *more or less displeasing* to GOD (for I would not choose to say, that ever the *person or character* of a sinner, upon the whole, can be said to be *pleasing or acceptable* to GOD, before he is *regenerated, pardoned and justified*) appears not obscurely from what our Saviour says of the young man in the gospel; and more especially from what he said to the *discreet scribe*; Luke xii. 34. *And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of GOD*; whereas it is said of others, that *they are far from righteousness*; now if there be indeed such a diversity of character among unregenerate men, as that, while some are said to be *far from righteousness*, others are said to be *near the kingdom of GOD*; what should be the reason of this difference? Can it be said of any two sinners, considered merely in a state of natural corruption, without the interposition of any *supernatural divine* influence,

that the *one* of them is *nearer* the kingdom of God, than the *other*? I think not. Is it not, therefore, the most natural solution of this difficulty, to suppose, that of *two* unregenerate sinners, the *one* may *less resist*, or *better improve*, these common operations of the good Spirit, than the *other*, and consequently be nearer to a *right temper* than he?

(*To be continued.*)

## THE FEARFUL MAN.

(*From Quarles' Meditations.*)

### *His Conflict.*

How potent are the infirmities of flesh and blood! How weak is Nature's strength! How strong her weakness! How is my easy faith abused by my deceitful sense! How is my understanding blinded with deluding error! How is my will perverted with apparent good! If real good present itself, how purblind is mine eye to view it! if viewed, how dull is my understanding to apprehend it! if apprehended, how heartless is my judgment to allow it! if allowed, how unwilling is my will to choose it! if chosen, how fickle are my resolutions to retain it! No sooner are my resolutions fixed upon a course of grace, but nature checks at my resolves; no sooner checked, but straight my will repents her choice, my judgment recalls her sentence, my understanding mistrusts her light; and then my sense calls flesh and blood to counsel, which wants no arguments to break me off. The difficulty of the journey daunts me; the straightness of the gate dismays me; the doubt of the reward diverts me; the loss of worldly pleasures here, deters me; the loss of earthly honour there, dissuades me; here the strictness of religion damps me; there the world's contempt disheartens me; here the fear of my preferment discourages me. Thus is my yielding sense assaulted with my conquering doubts; thus are my militant hopes made captive to my prevailing fears; whence, if happily ransomed by some good motion, the devil presents me with a *bea-roll* of my offences. The flesh suggests the necessity of my



sin, the world objects the foulness of my shame ; where, if I plead the mercy and goodness of my God, the abuse of his mercy weakens my trust, the slighting of his goodness hardens my heart against my hopes. With what an host of enemies art thou besieged, my soul ! how art thou assailed with continual fears ! how doth the guilt of thy unworthiness cry down the hopes of all compassion ! Thy confidence of mercy is conquered by the consciousness of thy own demerits, and thou art taken prisoner, and bound in the horrid chains of sad despair.

But cheer up, my soul, and turn thy fears to wonder and thanksgiving ; trust in him that saith

*Fear not, little flock ; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you a kingdom.* Luke xii. 32.

Col. i. 13.—*He hath delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into the kingdom of his dear Son.*

Acts xiv. 22.—*Exhort them to continue in the faith, and that we must, through many tribulations, enter into the kingdom of God.*

James ii. 5.—*Hath not God chosen the poor of this world, that they should be rich in faith, and heirs of the kingdom which he promised to them that love him ?*

Luke xii. 29.—*I appoint you a kingdom, as my Father appointed to me.*

*His Soliloquy.*

Hast thou crucified the Lord of Glory, O my soul ; and hast thou so much boldness to expect his kingdom ? Consult with reason, and review thy merits ; which done, behold that *Jesus* whom thou crucifiedst, ever making intercession for thee, and offering thee a crown of glory ! Behold the greatness of thy Creator, veiled with the goodness of thy Redeemer ; the justice of a first person qualified by the mercy of a second ; the purity of the divine nature uniting itself with the human in one *Emmanuel* ; a perfect man to suffer ; a perfect God to pardon ; and both God and man in one person, at the same instant, able and willing to give, and take, a perfect satisfaction for thee. O my soul, a wonder above wonders ! an incomprehensibility above all admiration ! a depth past all finding out ! Under this shadow, O my soul, refresh thyself. If thy sins fear the hand of

justice, behold thy sanctuary ; if thy offences tremble before the Judge, behold thy advocate ; if thy creditor threaten a prison, behold thy bail ; behold the Lamb of God that hath taken thy sins from thee : behold the blessed of Heaven and earth that hath prepared a kingdom for thee. Be ravished, O my soul ! oh bless the name of ELOHIM ! oh bless the name of our E-MANUEL, with praises and eternal hallelujahs !!

*His Prayer.*

Great Shepherd of my soul ! whose life was not too dear to rescue *me*, the meanest of thy little flock, cast down thy gracious eye upon the weakness of my nature, and behold it in the strength of thy compassion ; open mine eyes, that I may see that object which flesh cannot behold ; enlighten mine understanding, that I may clearly discern that truth which my ignorance cannot apprehend ; rectify my judgment, that I may confidently resolve those doubts which my understanding cannot determine ; sanctify my will, that I may wisely choose that good which my deceived heart cannot desire ; fortify my resolution, that I may constantly embrace that choice which my inconstancy cannot hold ; weaken the strength of my corrupted nature, that I may struggle with my lusts, and strive against the base rebellions of my flesh ; strengthen the weakness of my dejected spirit, that I may conquer myself, and still withstand the assaults of mine own corruption ; moderate my delight in the things of this world, and keep my desires within the limits of thy will ; let the point of my thoughts be directed to thee, and let my hopes rest in the assurance of thy favour ; let not the fear of worldly loss dismay me, nor let the loss of the world's favour daunt me ; let my joy in thee exceed all worldly grief, and let the love of thee expel all carnal fear ; let the multitude of my offences be hid in the multitude of thy compassions ; and let the reproachfulness of that death which thy Son suffered for my sake, enable me to suffer all reproach for his sake ; let not my sin against thy mercies remove thy mercies from my sin ; and let the necessity of my offences be swallowed up in the all-sufficiency of his merits ; let not the foulness of my transgressions lead me to distrust ; nor let the distrust of thy pardon leave me in despair. Fix in my heart a filial love, that I may love thee as a father ;

and remove all servile fear from me, that thou mayest behold me as a son. Be thou my all in all, and let me fear nothing but to displease thee ; that being freed from the fear of thy wrath, I may live in the comfort of thy promise, die in the fulness of thy favour, and rise to the inheritance of an everlasting kingdom.

---

*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

*(From a Correspondent.)*

*A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.*

3. *Of Free Will.*

[Continued from page 123.]

THE next passage to be noticed, is the much litigated one and confessedly the most difficult in the whole epistle ; which we find in the 5th chapter, from the 12th verse to the 19th. It is unquestionably a digression ; but of such a description, as is worthy of St. Paul ; and not gone into, without the design of making it subservient to his purpose. Its subserviency is here supposed to consist in there being set forth, that, as the mortality of Adam had an effect on the Gentiles, as well as on the Jews ; it was the more reasonable to expect, that the death of Christ applied on the like terms to both.

“ Wherefore [says the Apostle, v. 12.] as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin.” What is the death here spoken of ? A spiritual death, say some ; consisting in an utter insensibility to good. Be there such a death or not, it is a pity, from zeal for the establishing of it, to spoil the Apostle’s reasoning in this place. The death within his view was a known dispensation passing before the eyes of all ; and not to be involved in metaphysical disquisition. “ And so, death passed upon all men, in that (or in whom, meaning Adam) all have sinned.” Here may be thought to open on us the doctrine of federal headship ; since we are said to have all sinned



in Adam. But it is frequent with St. Paul, to put the cause for the effect; and he ought to be understood as doing so in this place; because it else contradicts the sentiment with which the passage teems; that of the loss of immortality by Adam's sin and not our own. The words can mean no more, than that in him all men became subject to the consequences of sin: And this makes the expression in question analogous to what is said 1 Kings i. 21. "I and my son Solomon shall be counted offenders"—literally "be sinners;" besides other instances of the same phraseology in the Old Testament. (V. 13.) "For until the law," that is, during the ages which were before it, "sin was in the world;" but sin is not imputed where there is no law." They who confine St. Paul's sense always to the letter would do well to consider, how far, on that plan, the last words go; which is even to the doing away of all imputation of sin, where there is no revealed law opposed to it. But this is not the meaning; which is no more, than that as death is the penalty of transgression against a positive law; and as a great proportion of mankind had not been under any law to which the said penalty had been attached; it must have been brought on them by a cause extraneous to themselves. (V. 14.) "Nevertheless, death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression:" that is, say some, death had extended to infants. It had so; but they cannot be intended in this place, because they had not sinned at all. For if, as St. Paul says in the 9th chapter, "the children yet unborn" can do "neither good nor evil;" the same surely may be said of them, for a considerable time subsequent to their births. No; it means those who have sinned against whatever better information they may have possessed; but not against a law, given to them under the sanction of death for disobedience. Such persons are indeed deserving of punishment: Yet as this particular punishment is represented in Scripture to be the appointed infliction on the violation of a positive law; we have no right to consider the subject as applicable to any who had not sinned in that way. In order to bring the doctrine home to the Apostle's point, it was important to him, after the mention of Adam, to hold him up as "a figure [or type] of him who was to come." This he does; but although there must, of course, be a resemblance between the antitype and type; yet he con-

tends that what is true of the one is more eminently so of the other.

Here comes in the most difficult part of the passage : and the difficulty consists in determining precisely the points of the dissimilitude affirmed. There shall be here given three interpretations ; each of them supported by a great name : But as no one of them is entirely satisfactory to the writer of these remarks ; he will take the liberty—which he trusts is not presumptuous, when the inquiry is concerning truth—to offer an interpretation of his own.

The first to be named, is that of Dr. Whitby. He thinks, that they who had sinned in their own persons may be said to have died on that account ; for instance, those Antideluvians, who were swept away by the flood. On this ground it is supposed, that, a deduction being made of all who had sinned in person ; the remainder are not so many, as those made alive by Christ : in which circumstance consisted the greater abounding of the gift, beyond the punishment. But this does not seem to answer the purpose ; since they who sinned and died would have died, if they had never sinned ; agreeably to what St. Paul says in another place, (1 Cor. xv. 22.) in contrariety to the idea stated —“ In Adam, all die.”

Accordingly this sense of Dr. Whitby is objected to by Mr. Locke ; who offers another, to the following effect. It is, that the stress of the similarity is in the unity of person, in each of the two cases : that is, as the offence came by one man—Adam ; so, the gift came by one man—Christ. But there must be, as a resemblance, so likewise a difference : and accordingly, the latter is supposed to consist in the contrast between the selfish appetite of Adam, which brought on the death of him and his posterity ; and the grace of Christ, which was of his free and abundant goodness. Here the difficulty is—but let it be spoken with due deference to so eminent a person—in the unsuitableness of the comparison drawn between the appetite of Adam and the benevolence of Christ. In order to square the construction with the argument ; it seems needful, that the things compared should not be in entire opposition to one another ; but, as to the matter in hand, alike : although one of them is to be supereminent over the other.

The third opinion is that of Mr. Taylor ; which lays the stress

on whatever grace or benefit there is in the Gospel, beyond the counteracting of the effects of Adam's sin. For as the comparison introduced by the Apostle obliged him to prove merely that the one was not more extensive than the other ; any particulars, wherein this should be found to exceed, appeared to Mr. Taylor to answer to "the abounding of the grace," making it disproportioned to the judgment. But it may be observed of the opinion of this ingenious gentleman, that he would perhaps have found it difficult to have shown, wherein the benefit obtained by the death of Christ went beyond the regaining of what was lost through Adam. For although many and precious are the fruits of the former, in the gifts and the aids of the holy Spirit ; yet they are all no more, than was necessary for the object to be accomplished. And besides, the supposed surplusage was at any rate—although great stress is supposed to be laid on it—foreign to the Apostle's argument ; which is best satisfied by a strict analogy.

With diffidence, another interpretation is here proposed. The idea which will govern in it, is, that although the passage is confessedly a digression ; yet the Apostle does not digress to such a length, as to lose sight of the point which he had been labouring ; and which it was his purpose to resume. There are two criticisms to be here made on the original. Mr. Locke translates "*οι πολλοι*" "the many:" And conformably to such a translation it will be found, that, although the article is seldom joined in the New Testament to the same adjective, yet, when they are given together, the adjective denotes, not an indefinite but a precise many. In regard to "*πολλω μάλλον*" translated "much more," it may be remarked, that it may mean here, not a greater measure, but an higher certainty ; as if it had been said—"much rather." And this is agreeable to the sense, which the same words evidently bear, in the 5th verse of the chapter now before us.

With the help of the principles laid down, we may now go on with the passage. "But [says the Apostle, v. 15.] not as the offence, so also is the free gift"—free alike to Jew and Gentile, without the condition of the burthensome institutions of the Levitical law. "For through the offence of one, the many"—that is, as well they who had sinned against a law denouncing death, as they who had no law to which that precise penalty was



annexed; or in other words, both Jews and Gentiles—"be dead;" that is, obnoxious to the event of death; much rather, or, with an higher degree of certainty—"the grace of God and the gift of grace which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto the [same] many." And to give another instance of the evidence of grace over that of punishment, he goes on thus—(v. 16) "Not as it was by one that sinned," meaning, by one man's sinning—"so is the gift; for the judgment was by one to condemnation." And if this could be the infliction of a righteous God; much more may we conceive it to be a part of his dispensation of mercy, that "the free gift is of many offences [if they have been committed] to justification." He goes on—(v. 17) "For if by one offence [as the margin properly has it] death reigned by one, much rather" may it be, considering God's overflowing mercy in the gospel, that "they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ." In both of the last preceding verses, there is here contemplated a reference to the Jewish prejudices opposed. And it seems an argument in point; that if, as was admitted, all descriptions of men had lost their immortality by another's fault, it might well be believed concerning a dispensation so beneficent as that of the gospel, that all descriptions of men might receive under it the fruits of the merits of another—freely: for this is the circumstance, on which the stress is laid; or without the pre-requisite of legal initiation and the subsequent burthen of legal works.

In the 18th verse next succeeding, it may seem unfavourable to the interpretation here given, that "the many" are changed to "all." But the interpretation is not to be given upon that account; because, if the scope of the passage give countenance to the application of "the many" to Jew and Gentile, it is not affected by the varying of the term; since the "all" now spoken of must be "the many," or both the descriptions spoken of before: especially, as the Apostle will be found to return to his first choice of words.

To go on then with the passage: "Therefore [adds the Apostle] as by one offence, judgment came upon all men"—Jew and Gentile—"to condemnation; so, by one righteousness;" that is, one act of it, "the free gift came upon all men," of the same variety of character, "unto justification of life."

Then the Apostle seems desirous of expressing the same truth in varied language, for the greater clearness. For, says he, (v. 19.) "as by one man's disobedience, the many [Jews and Gentiles] were made [or constituted] sinners;" that is, subjected to the consequences of another's sin; "so by the obedience of one, shall [the same] many be made righteous;" that is, not formally so; but as partaking of the blessed effects of his meritorious death. To those not attentive to the peculiarities of St. Paul's writing, it may seem a straining of this verse, to make "sinners" another expression for the being made subject to the consequences of sin. But let those who may be disposed to object to it be aware, not only of the pertinency of it to the argument; but of the consequence of insisting on the strict meaning of the word: which will be, that, as all sinned in Adam, without any subsequent consenting to it; so, all are released from the penalties of sin, by being made righteous in Christ, in virtue of his obedience; without any subsequent act, not to say of obedience of their own, but also of faith.

There has been given, it is trusted, the sense of this much litigated passage. If it should not be accurate in every particular; still it may be sufficiently so, for the purpose of the writer. On the ground of the interpretation, the Arminians can draw nothing from it, in favour of their system. For although there may seem something to this effect, in what is said of "all being made righteous;" and of the free gift to "the many," interpreted by respectable authority to be the same with "all;" yet, if these expressions are so positively applied, as is here affirmed, to different descriptions of collective bodies; little stress is to be laid on the use of them. What should further discourage all application of this sort, is the absolute nakedness of the Epistle, as to any evidence of there having been, in the mind of the Apostle, an inquiry into the extent of the offer of salvation, as the subject respected individuals; involving the question of few or many. No; the general argument of it applies "all" and "the many" to the Gentiles; contemplated in combination with the Jews in the enjoyment of the benefits of the gospel dispensation. And as those two descriptions of persons are kept steadily in view, through all the rest of the discussion; it seems impossible, that, in the digression which

has just now been before us, the Apostle should have gone out of his way ; in order to decide on a question not moved, so far as we know, at the time ; and not involved in the other question, which pressing circumstances had forced on him.

Much less, it is here conceived, has the passage any appearance of being favourable to the Calvinists. For there is nothing in it of federal representation ;\* nothing of the imputation of sin, except of men's sins to themselves ; and nothing of the corruption of human nature, whatever there may be of this in the passage that is to succeed. There is, indeed, in the passage which has been commented on, a death spoken of. And that this word, like other words, is sometimes transferred from its strict signification ; and used figuratively, to denote a spiritual subject ; must be granted. Even in this epistle we read—(ch. viii. v. 7) “to be carnally minded is death ;” meaning a spiritual one, no doubt. But in the passage which has been before us, it is the dissolution of our mortal nature : and if we give it any other sense ; we must take away all consistency from the passage, generally. The Calvinist in particular should be aware of giving it this construction ; because, considering the parallel which had been drawn by the Apostle ; it would then follow, that, as all had been under a spiritual death ; including an entire depravation of nature and subjection to everlasting punishment ; so, at least an opportunity of attaining to salvation has been bestowed on all ; if not rather, that it shall certainly be enjoyed by all : neither of which would be admitted by him, who subjects himself to such a consequence.

We proceed to another passage, weighty in meaning. It ought to be so, indeed, in the estimation of all ; but it is set up by one of the parties in view, as the substance of their whole system, so far as regards the actual state of man. And since the

\* The acknowledged forfeiture of immortality in Adam, of which the passage is evidently full, has been thought to favour the doctrine of federal representation. But we know of various ways, in which one man, through the fault of another, may forfeit a benefit, to which the right of the latter would otherwise have entitled the former. This happens, when a son, by his father's treason, loses an estate ; which was held of the sovereignty on the condition of allegiance ; or when the like thing happens, on the neglect of a condition provided for under a private tenure. In either of these cases, it would be entirely inconsistent with propriety, to consider the father as the representative of his son. This would be to suppose the son to be possessed of independent right ; whereas he could have had none, except what would have been transmitted to him, had there been no forfeiture through the father.



text, be the sense what it may, speaks of some thing, of which, if it exist, there must be a consciousness in the bosoms of all mankind; except of those who have risen superior to it by grace and even of them in a degree; it is to be hoped, that this very circumstance will help us to a right understanding of the passage. For it cannot be reasonably supposed of the Apostle, that he describes mankind, otherwise than as each individual knows of himself and observes of others.

The text intended is in the 7th verse of the 8th ch. where we read—"the carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." What is the carnal mind? doubtless, inordinate desire, expressed in the original by "*φρονημα σαρκος*:" which, literally translated, is "the mind of the flesh." There is a personification of the latter word; and to the figurative person thus brought into view, there is ascribed a will. And what is the enmity against God, here meant? certainly, the not being subject to his law; as is testified in the latter part of the verse. This is noticed, in order to guard against the construction, that St. Paul, in using the abstract, intended to insinuate the sentiment, that the carnally minded man must be a hater of God, in the proper sense of the expression; that is, of his being and his perfections. No; what it signifies is a contrariety to his perfections, in not being subject to his law: just as a subject may have a mind and manners alien from the laws of his sovereign; and, on that account, be under his just displeasure; while yet, he may be never thought or spoken of by the same subject, but with reverence and even with affection. Still, the character of such a subject is to be denominated from his ruling principle; and he must be contemplated, as a continual offender against his Prince.

For the understanding of the passage before us, we must look back to the 7th verse of the preceding chapter; from which, there is a continuation of kindred sentiment, to the verse before us.

The Apostle, through the whole, opposes the purity of the law to inbred sin; by reason of which, the law (v. 10) though "ordained to life," was "found to be unto death," by the condemning effect of the penalty annexed to it. He here uses some very strong expressions, as his manner sometimes is, and not in their most obvious senses. Thus he speaks (v. 8) of the law's

working in him all manner of concupiscence : not meaning this, surely, as to direct and designed effect ; but intending to show, that vicious propensities, the criminalty of which he would not otherwise have known, or at least not have known in its extent, were displayed to him in all their enormity, by the law. And thus it happened ; that, while compelled to acknowledge (v. 12) —“ the law is holy, and the commandment holy, just and good,” he became subjected by it to the sentence of death in his own conscience (v. 13) “ that sin”—here the Apostle seems to labour under an effort for the strongest expressions which language could supply—“ might become exceeding sinful :” meaning, not that it might become, by circumstances, more aggravated than it was in its own nature ; for that was impossible ; but that it might press with its whole weight on the awakened conscience.

In going on to the more immediate purpose of the present investigation, it will be necessary to state an opposition of opinion, among commentators and other writers ; some ascribing the struggle which the first part of the passage describes, to the stranger to gospel grace ; and others to the man subjected to its influence. On the opposite sides of the question ; there shall be here mentioned two men, who may be supposed nearly equal in the greatness of their talents—Mr. Locke and Dr. Samuel Clarke. Had the writer of this been left to his own understanding only ; he should have supposed it impossible to have entertained any other opinion, than that of the passage being designed of the sinner ; partly because the violence of the struggle seems little consistent with that subjection of passion, which must, in a considerable degree at least adorn the character of the Saint ; and further, because, in the conclusion, there is celebrated a triumph, as the effect of grace, in the struggle which had been described. Mr. Clarke is of the opinion, which has been here expressed. He supposes (serm. 9. vol. viii.) that the Apostle personates a man, who is at first a stranger both to the law and to the gospel ; who, afterwards, is subjected to the law, which lays him under its condemning sentence ; and who finally hears the consoling voice and is sensible of the powerful energy of the gospel. The opinion of Mr. Clarke, is consented in, by many respectable commentators ; of whom it may be sufficient to mention Dr. Hammond, Dr. Whitby, and Mr. Taylor. In the construction of this passage, Mr. Locke, agrees with the Calvin-



istic writers generally ; not excepting Calvin himself ; it being important to their system. Accordingly they give as a reason of their interpretation, that, in the unregenerate man, there can be no such good desire, as St. Paul describes.

We are then to suppose the Apostle speaking to us, not in his own person, but in three supposed characters. The first is that of a man, without either the law or the gospel. The Apostle says, meaning it of such a man (V. 9)—“ I was alive without the law once : ” that is, it being designed comparatively doubtless—I saw no necessary connection between sin and death. “ But,” says this man—now under a change of circumstances—“ when the commandment came, sin revived ; ” that is—the knowledge—the conviction—the sense of sin was excited in me in an higher degree than before the prohibitory ordinance—and—“ I died : ” that is, perceived myself to be subject to death, under the condemnation of the law. After several remarks, opening this sentiment more distinctly, the passage goes on, to describe the conflict between inordinate desire and the commandment set in opposition to it (V. 15 to 23)—“ That which I do, I allow not : for what I would, I do not ; but what I hate, that I do. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law, that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, that is in my flesh, dwelleth no good thing. For to will is present with me ; but how to perform that which is good, I find not. For the good that I would, I do not ; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man : but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members.”

The Apostle had thus discoursed of man, first in his natural state ; and then, as a subject of the Mosaic dispensation. After this, he discourses of a conflict, as belonging to both these states, but applied especially to the latter, which was more immediately connected with his design. Here we perceive two principles ; on one hand, a principle allowing, consenting to and delighting in what is good ; and on the other, a principle bringing into captivity to the evil, although a known enemy and hated. Now this



is no other, than that struggle between virtue and vice, which has been observed and lamented in mankind, under all the varieties of their condition; and which although more emphatically perhaps described by St. Paul than by any other, is in substance the same with the old and familiar adage—"Vido meliora proboque, deteriora sequor:" that is, "I see and approve of the better, but pursue the worse."

What establishes the interpretation here given of the passage, as applying to the natural and not to the Christian man; is that the Apostle, after having described the conflicting principles in the breast of the personated character, makes him exclaim, under a sense of the misery of his estate (V. 24)—"O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" then making him answer his own question, under the disclosure of gospel grace, supposed just then to open on him (V. 25)—"I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." The Apostle, returning to his former point, sums up what he had said concerning it, thus—"so then with the mind, I, this man" [*αυτος εγω*] who has been described, "serve the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin." To this view of the former subject, he still opposes the conclusion of the latter ch. viii. v. 1—"There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit." Are these the same persons, who were represented a few verses before, as dragged by fleshly appetite into sin, contrary to better conviction and better inclination? It cannot be: especially as the Apostle goes on, enlarging on the happy deliverance from the captivity, which had been groaned under before.

The effect which the foregoing passage has on the text, more immediately proposed to be commented on, must be obvious. When it is said—"the carnal mind" or, according to the most strict translation "the mind of the flesh is enmity against God;" the proposition cannot possibly be designed of a settled enmity against the Divine Being; but it relates to the lower principle, comprehended under the preceding delineation of human nature. That principle is, in itself, a necessary part of our present being: but when it breaks loose from its proper subjection to the law of God; it is then contemplated, is in hostility to him. The person thus under its misrule is then "carnally minded." And to be thus minded is "enmity against God:" or as it is said

in the next verse—"they that are in the flesh"—that is, sunk in its sensualities, so as to be detached from the pursuit of spiritual good—"cannot please God." They are in contrariety to his perfections and his laws; and obnoxious to his judgments.

The passage then, under this view of it, can have no relation to the controversy in question. And in regard to the interpretation which has been given to the immediately preceding passage, beginning in the 7th chapter; if that interpretation should be rejected, little will be thereby gained. There will then be given a harsh appearance to the description of a conflict between virtue and vice in the breast of an Apostle; in which also the latter is triumphant and the former borne down under it. But all that will follow is, that the conflict must be still more severe, in the heart that is a stranger to the ascendancy of gospel grace. If, in such a heart, there cannot be any good thought or any good desire; it must be proved by some other medium, than that before us: and this is all that has been pledged to be proved, concerning it.

The interpretation which has been given of the passage agrees perfectly with the design of the Apostle; which was to show the insufficiency of the law and the efficacy of grace. To the same purpose tends the immediate connection of the words which have been made the most prominent in this discussion. For St. Paul, speaks of having been "without the law once:" which shows that he personates another; because he had never been without the law himself. And then, on the contrary supposition, there is the opposition of the character drawn of the regenerate man to many places in scripture; such as—"they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts;" with many things to the same effect.

There is a striking fact of early times, showing how much the passage in question has been seen to stand in the way of the doctrine now called Calvinistic. Before the time of St. Austin, it had been uniformly interpreted—among others by Tertullian, Origen and Chrysostom—of man first in his natural state, then under the law and lastly under the gospel. Austin himself had explained it in the same way. But having afterwards adopted some of the sentiments since called Calvinistic, he revoked the interpretation; and applied the passage to the struggle still subsisting in the regenerate man, between grace

and nature. But even under this change, he seems to have shrunk back from the full length of the modern Calvinistic interpretation. For he makes the struggle to consist in a concupiscence, in contrariety to a will drawing another way. Austin's motive in this seems to have been the avoiding of a sanction for sin, from his novel interpretation; which was to his purpose in his controversy with the Palegians. But in order to bring those things together, he tortured the verb *προσκειναι* [to do] into a motion of the mind, which it never signifies; and not only this, but to represent a will and a counter-will as operating at the same moment. This appears unreasonable, because, without willing, there can be no concupiscence; while yet this is the very thing from which Austin describes the man in question, as willing to be delivered. Calvin rid himself of all this difficulty; but at the expense of an interpretation, which describes the best of men as under the worst sort of captivity—that of sin.

Perhaps the evidence which has been given of the interference of the passage with the Calvinistic scheme may be considered as passing it to the credit of the Arminian. There is however a circumstance unfavourable to this sentiment. The Apostle, where he describes the struggle, makes it between nature and a sense of sin under the law; on which account, it may perhaps be said, that the same thing is not to be predicated of nature simply, on the authority of this passage. For this reason, although the author considers it so subversive of Calvinism, yet he does not discern in it an explicit support of the other system.\*

If there be any other passages, falling under the question, they have escaped the recollection of the writer of this: And therefore, he goes on to the next department of this work.

*(To be continued.)*

\* What is here stated concerning St. Austin's interpretation of the passage is given more at large in Bishop Taylor on Repentance, ch. viii. sect. 3.



*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

THE WIDOW'S SON RAISED TO LIFE.

SEE, a long procession moving!  
'Tis a *corse* the crowd attend ;  
To his narrow house they're bearing,  
Once their comrade and their friend.

Silent, slow, the bier attending,  
- Each funereal rite to pay ;  
'Tis a sad, a solemn lesson  
To the thoughtless, light, and gay !

Silent, slow, the mourners follow !  
Youth, nor love, his life could save ;  
A fond parent's darling treasure  
Sinks to an untimely grave.

See, a woe-worn mother follow,  
Death has ta'en her only hope ;  
First he seiz'd her youthful part'ner,  
Now has torn her only prop.

Soon as he advanc'd to manhood,  
Love and duty warm'd his heart ;  
Hope still pictur'd pleasing prospects,  
Death, grim tyrant ! aim'd his dart !

Silent, hopeless, broken-hearted,  
See, she follows to the grave ;  
Torn with grief for joys departed ;—  
But a *friend* appears to save.

Now the *Lord of Life* advances !  
Love and pity mov'd his breast ;  
Now, with looks of tender mercy  
Touch'd the bier—the bearers rest.

Call'd to life, the soul departed  
Reanimates the lifeless frame;  
And the now enraptur'd mother  
Receives her much lov'd son again.

Struck, the crowd admiring view,  
And upon each other gaze!  
Still they doubt the vision true,  
Lost in wonder and amaze!

Now our Saviour takes his way,  
Still on thoughts of love intent,  
Did his miracles display,  
Wheresoe'er his course he bent.

*Pitying Saviour!* every action  
Speaks thy majesty and love;  
May our grateful hearts adoring,  
Love and duty strive to prove!

S.

*Poughkeepsie.*

---

*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

ON PULPIT ELOQUENCE.

TO wake the soul, the languid to inspire,  
With holy rapture, with seraphic fire;  
To raise to holy love the heart that's cold,  
Recall the wand'rer to the *Christian* fold,—

Are gifts divine! imparted to the few  
Who zealously their Saviour's cause pursue:  
Warm'd by *his love* their souls are thence inspir'd,  
Touch'd with a coal from off *his altar* fir'd.

Such be our *Priests*; may a *Redeemer's* laws  
Dwell in their hearts, and warm them to his cause;  
O may they *feel* the doctrine which they teach,  
And with true energy their Master preach.

O may *his* love in every bosom glow,  
*His* will be done in this our world below,  
 Till fitted for a better, happier state,  
 With *faith* and *hope* we shall *his* coming wait.

T.

*Poughkeepsie.*

## R E V I E W.

*For the Churchman's Magazine.*

*Cælebs in search of a Wife. Comprehending Observations on Domestic Habits and Manners, Religion and Morals. 2 vols. 12mo. From the second London edition. New-York. T. & J. Swords. 1809.*

**RELIGIOUS** principles and rules of conduct are most successfully illustrated and rendered interesting by the application of them to the characters and incidents of common life. The author of this work, who is said to be the celebrated Mrs. More, has availed herself of this truth. It was her object to expose the fashionable vices of the day; to correct many of the errors in the present system of female education; and to exhibit sound principles of religion and morals. To effect these important and laudable objects, she introduces a young man, of wealth, of amiable manners, and correct piety, and engages him in the most interesting of all human pursuits—the pursuit of a wife—of

“Domestic happiness—the only bliss of Paradise

“That has survived the fall.”

The wife of whom he is in pursuit, for whom, as may be expected, he searches in vain in the circles of fashionable dissipation, and whom he at last finds in the daughter of the pious and valued friend of his deceased father, is described as—  
 “from nature; a woman, gentle, feeling, animated, modest—  
 by education; elegant, informed, enlightened—from religion;  
 pious, humble, candid, charitable.” We are sure that “Cæ-



lebs," the hero of the story, is not the only *unmarried man* who would consider the event as "blessed," which should reward his pursuit with such a wife!

There is scarcely incident enough in the work to entitle it to the name of a novel; or indeed to render it very interesting as a domestic tale. In a serious work, it would be improper to expect to find those highly wrought scenes by which the writers of novels and romance excite the imagination and feelings of their readers. But we are of opinion that without transgressing the bounds of probability, or violating the decorum of religious truth, the performance before us would have been rendered more sprightly and interesting, had the story been diversified by a greater variety of incidents. Cælebs visits London, and is made to offer many judicious remarks on the various characters which pass before him. He performs the same office during his visit to the family of the friend of his deceased father in the country. But with the exception of one or two stories, there do not occur any of those interesting incidents which often diversify the round of real life. The narration of these incidents renders a work frequently more striking and interesting, because more natural than any of the fictitious scenes of novels and romance.

But what this performance wants in the variety and interest of its occurrences, it makes up in the chasteness, neatness, and often flowing tenderness of its style, and in its judicious observations on the important topics of religion, morals, and domestic life. If the report be accurate which ascribes it to the pen of Mrs. More, we consider it as affording a more unequivocal proof of her attachment to the Church of England, of which she is a member, than any of her preceding performances. Excellent and valuable as these have been, those of them which discussed the topics of religion, have certainly been too exclusively directed against that dangerous extreme which strips Christianity of its peculiar doctrines, and makes it to consist in little more than external decency of manners. We have never seen her animated pen depicting the dangers of the opposite extreme of enthusiasm, and of that excessive zeal for what are called the doctrines of grace, which tends to undermine the foundations of genuine piety and morals. Not so the work before us. Here both these extremes are exposed with exquisite judgment

and with delicate severity. She appears to have been impressed with the importance of the maxim—*In medio tutissimus ibis*, or, of an injunction which on a pious mind would weigh with the greatest force—"Let your *moderation* be known unto all men." The extreme of Calvinism, which discarding conditions from the plan of salvation, resolves it entirely into the decree of God selecting unconditionally certain individuals to everlasting life; and the extreme of Socinianism, which denying to the Creator his due agency in the new creation of the soul to virtue, resolves the whole process of salvation into the agency of the creature, are both very justly exposed and reprobated. And while the Formalist may behold the inefficacy of a religion which does not purify and interest the heart, the Enthusiast is taught the danger of trusting to mere fervour of feeling, to raptures which have no sense, and to a cant which has no meaning.

The interesting subject of female education occupies many of the pages of these volumes; and the errors of the modern system which substitutes accomplishments for solid acquisitions, and the ornaments of the body for the graces of the mind, are combated sometimes with the weapons of pleasantry and humour, and sometimes with grave argument and satire. The advice which Cælebs receives from his mother with respect to the choice of a wife, exhibits that system of female education which it is the object of this work to inculcate.

"My mother, when she was in tolerable spirits, was now frequently describing the kind of woman whom she wished me to marry. 'I am so firmly persuaded, Charles,' would she kindly say, 'of the justness of your taste, and the rectitude of your principles, that I am not much afraid of your being misled by the captivating exterior of any woman who is greatly deficient either in sense or conduct; but remember, my son, that there are many women against whose characters there lies nothing very objectionable, who are yet little calculated to taste, or to communicate rational happiness. Do not indulge romantic ideas of superhuman excellence. Remember that the fairest creature is a fallen creature. Yet let not your standard be low. If it be absurd to expect perfection, it is not unreasonable to expect *consistency*. Do not suffer yourself to be caught by a shining quality, till you know it is not counteracted by the opposite defect. Be not taken in by strictness in one point, till you are assured there is no laxity in others. In character, as in architecture, propor-



tion is beauty. The education of the present race of females is not very favourable to domestic happiness. For my own part, I call education, not that which smothers a woman with accomplishments, but that which tends to consolidate a firm and regular system of character ; that which tends to form a friend, a companion, and a wife. I call education, not that which is made up of the shreds and patches of useless arts, but that which inculcates principles, polishes taste, regulates temper, cultivates reason, subdues the passions, directs the feelings, habituates to reflection, trains to self-denial, and, more especially, that which refers all actions, feelings, sentiments, tastes, and passions, to the love and fear of God."

Cælebs had received an injunction from a revered father that he would not fix on a partner for life, till he had visited and consulted a very near friend who resided in Hampshire. Previously however to this tour, to Stanley Grove, the seat of Mr. Stanley, the friend of his father, he resolves on a journey to London. Besides the inducement to visit the metropolis from its affording in the highest degree the means of "intellectual improvement and colloquial pleasure," he connected with this inducement

"The hope, that, in a more extended survey, I might be more likely to select a deserving companion for life. 'In such a companion,' said I, as I drove along in my post chaise, 'I do not want a Helen, a Saint Cecilia, or a Madame Dacier ; yet she must be elegant, or I should not love her ; sensible, or I should not respect her ; prudent, or I should not confide in her ; well-informed, or she could not educate my children ; well-bred, or she could not entertain my friends ; *consistent*, or I should offend the shade of my mother ; pious, or I should not be happy with her, because the prime comfort in a companion for life is the delightful hope that she will be a companion for eternity."

London, as may be expected, affords him ample opportunity for observation on the varieties of the human character ; but, as may be expected, he does not find in London a wife. His first visit to the family of a good-natured friendly man, whom he had occasionally seen in the North, affords the following scene—

"At dinner there appeared two pretty looking young ladies, daughters of my friend, who had been some time a widower. I placed myself between them, for the purpose of prying a little into their minds, while the rest of the company were conversing on indifferent subjects. Having formerly heard this gentleman's



deceased wife extolled as the mirror of managers, and the arrangements of his table highly commended, I was surprised to see it so ill appointed, and every thing wearing marks of palpable inelegance. Though no epicure, I could not forbear observing that many of the dishes were out of season, ill chosen, and ill dressed.

"While I was puzzling my head for a solution, I recollected that I had lately read in a most respectable periodical work, a paper (composed, I believe, however by a raw recruit of that well disciplined corps) which insisted that nothing tended to make ladies so useless and inefficient in the *menage* as the study of the dead languages. I jumped to the conclusion, and was in an instant persuaded that my young hostesses must not only be perfect mistress of Latin, but the *tout ensemble* was so ill arranged as to induce me to give them full credit for Greek also.

"Finding, therefore, that my appetite was baulked, I took comfort in the certainty that my understanding would be well regaled; and after secretly regretting that learning should so effectually destroy usefulness, I was resolved to derive intellectual comfort from this too classical repast. Turning suddenly to the eldest lady, I asked her at once if she did not think Virgil the finest poet in the world. She blushed, and thus confirmed me in the opinion that her modesty was equal to her erudition. I repeated my question with a little *cicumlocution*. She stared and said she had never heard of the person I mentioned, but that she had read Tears of Sensibility, and Rosa Matilda, and Sympathy of Souls, and Too Civil by Half, and the Sorrows of Werter, and the Stranger, and the Orphans of Snowdon."

"Yes, sir," joined in the younger sister, who did not rise to so high a pitch of literature, "and we have read Perfidy Punished, and Jemmy and Jenny Jessamy, and the Fortunate Footman, and the Illustrious Chambermaid." I blushed and stared in my turn; and here the conversation, through the difficulty of our being intelligible to each other, dropped; and I am persuaded that I sunk much lower in their esteem for not being acquainted with their favourite authors, than they did in mine for having never heard of Virgil.

"I arose from the table with a full conviction that it is very possible for a woman to be totally ignorant of the ordinary but indispensable duties of common life without knowing one word of Latin; and that her being a bad companion is no infallible proof of her being a good economist.

"I am afraid the poor father saw something of my disappointment in my countenance, for when we were alone in the evening he observed, that a heavy addition to his other causes of regret for the loss of his wife, was her excellent management of his family. I found afterwards that, though she had brought him

a great fortune, she had had a very low education. Her father, a coarse country Squire, to whom the pleasures of the table were the only pleasures for which he had any relish, had no other ambition for his daughter but that she should be the most famous housewife in the country. He gloried in her culinary perfections, which he understood; of the deficiencies of her mind he had not the least perception. Money and good eating, he owned, were the only things in life which had a real intrinsic value; the value of all other things, he declared, existed in the imagination only.

"The poor lady, when she became a mother, and was brought out into the world, felt keenly the deficiencies of her own education. The dread of Scylla, as is usual, wrecked her on Charybdis. Her first resolution, as soon as she had daughters, was that they should *learn every thing*. All the masters who teach things of little intrinsic use were extravagantly paid for super-numerary attendance; and as no one in the family was capable of judging of their improvements, their progress was but slow. Though they were taught much, they learnt but little, even of these unnecessary things; and of things necessary they learnt nothing. Their well-intentioned mother was not aware that her daughters' education was almost as much calculated to gratify the senses, though in a different way, and with more apparent refinement, as her own had been; and that *mind* is left nearly as much out of the question in making an ordinary artist as in making a good cook."

In one of his visits, Cælebs meets with a self-sufficient, and censorious, but well-meaning religious zealot. We wish that Cælebs were the only person who had ever witnessed a piety "debased by coarseness, disfigured by asperity," and relying principally on "internal feelings," to the neglect of "the government of the tongue, and the command of the passions."

"I went almost immediately after, at the invitation of Mr. Ranby, to pass a few days at his villa at Hampstead. Mr. and Mrs. Ranby were esteemed pious persons, but having risen to great affluence by a sudden turn of fortune in a commercial engagement, they had a little self-sufficiency, and not a little disposition to ascribe an undue importance to wealth. This I should have thought more pardonable under their circumstances, had I not expected that religion would in this respect have more than supplied the deficiencies of education. Their religion, however, consisted almost exclusively in a disproportionate zeal for a very few doctrines. And though they were far from being immoral in their own practice, yet, in their discourse, they affected to undervalue morality.



"This was, indeed, more particularly the case with the lady, whose chief object of discourse seemed to be, to convince me of her great superiority to her husband in polemical skill. Her chaste conversation certainly was not coupled with fear. In one respect she was the very reverse of those Pharisees who were scrupulously exact about their petty observances. Mrs. Ranby was, on the contrary, anxious about a very few important particulars, and exonerated herself from the necessity of all inferior attentions. She was strongly attached to one or two preachers, and discovered little candour for all others, or for those who attended them. Nay, she somewhat doubted of the soundness of the faith of her friends and acquaintance who would not incur great inconvenience to attend one or other of her favourites.

"Mrs. Ranby's table was 'more than hospitably good.' There was not the least suspicion of Latin here. The eulogist of female ignorance might have dined in comfortable security against the intrusion and vanity of erudition. She had three daughters, not unpleasing young women. But I was much concerned to observe, that they were not only dressed to the very extremity of the fashion, but their drapery was as transparent, as short, and as scanty; there was as sedulous a disclosure of their persons, and as great a redundancy of ornaments, as I had seen in the gayest circles.

'Expect not perfection,' said my good mother, 'but look for consistency.' This principle my parents had not only taught me in the closet, but had illustrated by their deportment in the family and in the world. They observed a uniform correctness in their general demeanor. They were not over anxious about character for its own sake, but they were tenderly vigilant not to bring any reproach on the Christian name by imprudence, negligence, or inconsistency, even in small things. 'Custom,' said my mother, 'can never alter the immutable nature of right; fashion can never justify any practice which is improper in itself; and to dress indecently is as great an offence against purity and modesty, when it is the fashion, as when it is obsolete. There should be a line of demarcation somewhere. In the article of dress and appearance Christian mothers should make a stand. They should not be so unreasonable as to expect that a young girl will of herself have courage to oppose the united temptations of fashion without, and the secret prevalence of corruption within: and authority should be called in where admonition fails.'

"The conversation after dinner took a religious turn. Mrs. Ranby was not unacquainted with the subject, and expressed herself with energy on many serious points. I could have been glad, however, to have seen her views a little more prac-



tical, and her spirit a little less censorious. I saw she took the lead in debate, and that Mr. Ranby submitted to act as subaltern ; but whether his meekness was the effect of piety or fear I could not at that time determine. She protested vehemently against all dissipation, in which I cordially joined her, though I hope with something less intemperance of manner, and less acrimony against those who pursued it. I began, however, to lose sight of the errors of the daughters' dress in the pleasure I felt at conversing with so pious a mother of a family. For pious she really was, though her piety was a little debased by coarseness, and not a little disfigured by asperity.

" I was sorry to observe that the young ladies not only took no part in the conversation, but that they did not even seem to know what was going on ; and, I must confess, the *manner* in which it was conducted was not calculated to make the subject interesting. The girls sat jogging and whispering each other, and got away as fast as they could.

" As soon as they were withdrawn—' There, Sir,' said the mother, ' are three girls who will make excellent wives. They never were at a ball or a play in their lives ; and yet, though I say it, who should not say it, they are as highly accomplished as any ladies at St. James's.' I cordially approved the former part of her assertion, and bowed in silence to the latter.

" I took this opportunity of inquiring what had been her mode of religious instruction for her daughters ; but though I put the question with much caution and deference, she looked displeased, and said she did not think it necessary to do a great deal in that way ; all these things must come from above ; it was not human endeavours, but divine grace which made Christians. I observed that the truth appeared to be, that divine grace  *blessing* human endeavours seemed most likely to accomplish that great end. She replied, that experience was not on my side, for that the children of religious parents were not always religious. I allowed that it was too true. I knew she drew her instances from two or three of her own friends, who, while they discovered much earnestness about their own spiritual interests, had almost totally neglected the religious cultivation of their children ; the daughters in particular had been suffered to follow their own devices, and to waste their days in company of their own choosing, and in the most frivolous manner. ' What do ye more than others ?' is an interrogation which this negligence has frequently suggested. Nay, professing serious piety, if ye do not more than those who profess it not, ye do less.

" I took the liberty to remark, that though there was no such thing as hereditary holiness, no entail of goodness ; yet the Almighty had promised in the scriptures many blessings to the offspring of the righteous. He never meant, however, that re-

ligion was to be transferred arbitrarily like an heir-loom; but the promise was accompanied with conditions and injunctions. The directions were express and frequent, to inculcate early and late the great truths of religion; nay, it was enforced with all the minuteness of detail, 'precept upon precept, line upon line, here a little and there a little'—at all times and seasons, 'walking by the way, and sitting in the house.' I hazarded the assertion, that it would *generally* be found that where the children of pious parents turned out ill, there had been some mistake, some neglect, or some fault on the part of the parents; that they had not used the right methods. I observed, that I thought it did not at all derogate from the sovereignty of the Almighty that he appointed certain means to accomplish certain ends; and that the adopting these, in conformity to his appointment, and dependence on his blessing, seemed to be one of the cases in which we should prove our faith by our obedience.

"I found I had gone too far—she said, with some warmth, that she was not wanting in any duty to her daughters; she set them a good example, and she prayed daily for their conversion. I highly commended her for both, but risked the observation, 'that praying without instilling principles might be as inefficacious as instruction without prayer. That it was like a husbandman who should expect that praying for sunshine should produce a crop of corn in a field where not one grain had been sown. God, indeed, *could* effect this, but he does not do it; and the means being of his own appointment, his omnipotence is not less exerted, by his directing certain effects to follow certain causes, than it would be by any arbitrary act.' As it was evident that she did not choose to quarrel with me, she contented herself with saying coldly, that she perceived I was a *legalist*, and had but a low view of divine things.

"At tea I found the young ladies took no more interest in the conversation than they had done at dinner, but sat whispering and laughing, and netting white silk gloves till they were summoned to the harpsichord. Despairing of getting on with them in company, I proposed a walk in the garden. I now found them as willing to talk, as destitute of any thing to say. Their conversation was vapid and frivolous. They laid great stress on small things. They seemed to have no shades in their understanding, but used the strongest terms for the commonest occasions, and admiration was excited by things hardly worthy to command attention. They were extremely glad, and extremely sorry, on subjects not calculated to excite affections of any kind. They were animated about trifles, and indifferent on things of importance. They were, I must confess, frank and good natured; but it was evident that as they were too open to have any thing to conceal, so they were too uninformed



to have any thing to produce ; and I was resolved not to risk my happiness with a woman who could not contribute her full share towards spending a wet winter cheerfully in the country.

“ The next day all the hours from breakfast to dinner were devoted to the harp. I had the vanity to think that this sacrifice of time was made in compliment to me, as I had professed to like music ; till I found that all their mornings were spent in the same manner, and the only fruit of their education, which seemed to be used to any purpose, was, that after their family devotions in the evening, they sung and played a hymn. This was almost the only sign they gave of intellectual or spiritual life. They attended morning prayers if they were dressed before the bell rang. One morning when they did not appear till late, they were reprovèd by their father ; Mrs. Ranby said, ‘ she should be more angry with them for their irregularity, were it not that Mr. Ranby obstinately persisted in reading a printed form, which she was persuaded could not do any body much good.’ The poor man, who was really well disposed, very properly defended himself by saying, that he hoped his own heart went along with every word he read ; and as to his family, he thought it much more beneficial for them to join in an excellent composition of a judicious divine, than to attend to any such crude rhapsody as he should be able to produce, whose education had not qualified him to lead the devotions of others.\* I had never heard him venture to make use of his understanding before ; and I continued to find it much better than I had at first given him credit for. The lady observed, with some asperity, that where there were *gifts* and *graces*, it superseded the necessity of learning.

“ In vindication of my own good breeding, I should observe that, in my little debates with Mrs. Ranby, to which I was always challenged by her, I never lost sight of that becoming example of the son of Cato, who, when about to deliver sentiments which might be thought too assuming in so young a man, introduced his admonitions with this modest preface,

Remember what our *father* oft has taught us.

“ I, without quoting the son of the sage of Utica, constantly adduced the paternal authority for opinions, which might savour too much of arrogance without such a sanction.

“ I observed in the course of my visit that self-denial made no part of Mrs. Ranby’s religious plan. She fancied, I believe, that it savoured of works, and of works she was evidently afraid. She talked as if activity were useless, and exertion unnecessary, and as if, like inanimate matter, we had nothing to do but to sit still and be shone upon.

\* Let the advocates of extempore prayer attend to this.



"I assured her that though I depended on the mercy of God, through the merits of his Son, for salvation, as entirely as she could do, yet I thought that Almighty grace, so far from setting aside diligent exertion, was the principle which promoted it. That salvation is in no part of scripture represented as attainable by the indolent Christian, if I might couple such contradictory terms. That I had been often awfully struck with the plain declarations, 'that the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence'—'strive to enter in at the strait gate'—'whatsoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might'—'give diligence to make your calling sure'—'work out your own salvation.' To this labour, this watchfulness, this sedulity of endeavour, the crown of life is expressly promised, and salvation is not less the free gift of God, because he has annexed certain conditions to our obtaining it.\*

"The more I argued, the more I found my reputation decline; yet to argue she compelled me. I really believe she was sincere, but she was ill informed, governed by feelings and impulses, rather than by the plain express rule of scripture. It was not that she did not read scripture, but she interpreted it her own way; built opinions on insulated texts; did not compare scripture with scripture, except as it concurred to strengthen her bias. She considered with a disproportionate fondness those passages which supported her preconceived opinions, instead of being uniformly governed by the general tenor and spirit of the sacred page. She had far less reverence for the preceptive, than for the doctrinal parts, because she did not sufficiently consider faith as an operative influential principle; nor did she conceive that the sublimest doctrines involve deep practical consequences. She did not consider the government of the tongue, nor the command of her passions, as forming any material part of the Christian character. Her zeal was fiery, because her temper was so; and her charity was cold, because it was an expensive propensity to keep warm. Among the perfections of the Redeemer's character, she did not consider his being 'meek and lowly' as an example, the influence of which was to extend to her. She considered it indeed as *admirable*, but not as *imitable*; a distinction she was very apt to make in all her practical dissertations, and in her interpretation of scripture.

"In the evening Mrs. Ranby was lamenting in general and rather customary terms, her own exceeding sinfulness. Mr. Ranby said, 'You accuse yourself rather too heavily, my dear, you have sins to be sure.' 'And pray what sins have I, Mr.

\* We are glad to see this from one of the school of Wilberforce. *Conditions* are discarded from the *Calvinistic* system, to which it has been supposed the excellent Wilberforce and his followers are somewhat inclined. *Rev.*

Ranby?" said she, turning upon him with so much quickness that the poor man started. 'Nay,' said he meekly, 'I did not mean to offend you; so far from it, that hearing you condemn yourself so grievously, I intended to comfort you, and to say that, except a few faults,—' 'And pray what faults?' interrupted she, continuing to speak however, lest he should catch an interval to tell them. 'I defy you, Mr. Ranby, to produce one.' 'My dear,' replied he, 'as you charged yourself with all, I thought it would be letting you off cheaply by naming only two or three, such as ——.' Here fearing matters would go too far, I interposed, and softening things as much as I could for the lady, said, 'I conceived that Mr. Ranby meant, that though she partook of the general corruption—' Here Ranby, interrupting me with more spirit than I thought he possessed, said 'General corruption, Sir, must be the source of particular corruption. I did not mean that my wife was worse than other women.'—'Worse, Mr. Ranby, worse?' cried she. Ranby, for the first time in his life, not minding her, went on,—'As she is always insisting that the whole species is corrupt, she cannot help allowing that she herself has not quite escaped the infection. Now, to be a sinner in the gross, and a saint in the detail; that is, to have all sins, and no faults, is a thing I do not quite comprehend.'

"After he had left the room, which he did as the shortest way of allaying the storm, she apologized for him, said, 'he was a well-meaning man, and acted up to the little light he had;' but added, 'that he was unacquainted with religious feelings, and knew little of the nature of conversion.'

"Mrs. Ranby, I found, seems to consider Christianity as a kind of free-masonry, and therefore thinks it superfluous to speak on serious subjects to any but the initiated. If they do not *return the sign*, she gives them up as blind and dead. She thinks she can only make herself intelligible to those to whom certain peculiar phrases are familiar; and though her friends may be correct, devout, and both doctrinally and practically pious; yet if they cannot catch a certain mystic meaning, if there is not a sympathy of intelligence between her and them, if they do not fully conceive of impressions, and cannot respond to mysterious communications, she holds them unworthy of intercourse with her. She does not so much insist on high moral excellence as the criterion of their worth, as on their own account of their internal feelings.

"She holds very cheap that gradual growth in piety which is, in reality, no less the effect of divine grace, than those instantaneous conversions which she believes to be so common. She cannot be persuaded that, of every advance in piety, of every improvement in virtue, of every illumination of the un-



derstanding, of every amendment in the heart, of every rectification of the will, the spirit of God is no less the author, because it is progressive, than if it were sudden. It is true, Omnipotence can, when he pleases, still produce these instantaneous effects, as he has sometimes done; but as it is not his established or common mode of operation, it seems vain and rash presumptuously to wait for these miraculous interferences. An implicit dependence, however, on such interferences, is certainly more gratifying to the genius of enthusiasm, than the anxious vigilance, the fervent prayer, the daily struggle, the sometimes scarcely perceptible though constant progress of the sober-minded Christian. Such a Christian is fully aware that his heart requires as much watching in the more advanced as in the earliest stages of his religious course. He is cheerful in a well-grounded hope, and looks not for ecstasies till that hope be swallowed up in fruition. Thankful if he feel in his heart a growing love to God, and an increasing submission to his will, though he is unconscious of visions, and unacquainted with any revelation but that which God has made in his word. He remembers, and he derives consolation from the remembrance, that his Saviour, in his most gracious and soothing invitation to the 'heavy laden,' has mercifully promised 'rest,' but he has no where promised rapture."

The sentiments in the last paragraph of the foregoing extract are highly judicious, and are expressed in that neat and tender style which gratifies the taste and interests the heart.

We present our readers with characters of an opposite stamp from the one which they have been contemplating.

"On a further acquaintance, I found Sir John and Lady Belfield to be persons of much worth. They were candid, generous, and sincere. They saw the errors of the world in which they lived, but had not resolution to emancipate themselves from its shackles. They partook, indeed, very sparingly of its diversions, not so much because they suspected their evil tendency, as because they were weary of them, and because they had better resources in themselves.

"Indeed, it is wonderful that more people from mere good sense and just taste, without the operation of any religious consideration, do not, when the first ardour is cooled, perceive the futility of what is called pleasure, and decline it as the man declines the amusements of the child. But fashionable society produces few persons who, like the ex-courtier of King David, assign their fourscore years as a reason for no longer 'delighting in the voice of singing men and singing women.'

"Sir John and Lady Belfield, however, kept up a large



general acquaintance ; and it is not easy to continue to associate with the world, without retaining something of its spirit. Their standard of morals was high, compared with that of those with whom they lived ; but when the standard of the Gospel was suggested, they drew in a little, and thought *things might be carried too far*. There was nothing in their practice which made it their interest to hope that Christianity might not be true. They both assented to its doctrines, and lived in a kind of general hope of its final promises. But their views were neither correct, nor elevated. They were contented to generalize the doctrines of scripture, and though they venerated its awful truths in the aggregate, they rather took them upon trust than laboured to understand them, or to imbue their minds with the spirit of them. Many a high professor, however, might have blushed to see how carefully they exercised not a few Christian dispositions ; how kind and patient they were ! how favourable in their construction of the actions of others ! how charitable to the necessitous ! how exact in veracity ! and how tender of the reputation of their neighbour !

“ Sir John had been early hurt by living so much with men of the world, with wits, politicians, and philosophers. This, though he had escaped the contagion of false principles, had kept back the growth of such as were true. Men versed in the world, and abstracted from all religious society, begin, in time, a little to suspect whether their own religious opinions may not possibly be wrong, or at least rigid, when they see them so opposite to those of persons to whose judgment they are accustomed to look up in other points. He found too, that in the society in which he lived, the reputation of religion detracted much from that of talents ; and a man does not care to have his understanding questioned by those in whose opinion he wishes to stand well. This apprehension did not, indeed, drive him to renounce his principles, but it led him to conceal them ; and that piety which is forcibly kept out of sight, which has nothing to fortify, and every thing to repel it, is too apt to decline.

“ His marriage with an amiable woman, whose virtues and graces attached him to his own home, drew him off from the most dangerous of his prior connections. This union had at once improved his character and augmented his happiness. If Lady Belfield erred, it was through excess of kindness and candour. Her kindness led to the too great indulgence of her children, and her candour to the too favourable construction of the errors of her acquaintance. She was the very reverse of my Hampstead friend. Whereas Mrs. Ranby thought hardly any body would be saved, Lady Belfield comforted herself that hardly any body was in danger. This opinion was not taken

up as a palliative to quiet her conscience on account of the sins of her own conduct, for her conduct was remarkably correct, but it sprung from a natural sweetness of temper, joined to a mind not sufficiently informed and guided by scriptural truth. She was candid and teachable; but as she could not help seeing that she had more religion than most of her acquaintance, she felt a secret complacency in observing how far her principles rose above theirs, instead of a humbling conviction of how far her own fell below the requisitions of the gospel.

"The fundamental error was, that she had no distinct view of the corruption of human nature. She often lamented the weaknesses and vices of individuals, but thought all vice an incidental not a radical mischief, the effect of thoughtlessness and casual temptation. She talked with discrimination of the faults of some of her children; but while she rejoiced in the happier dispositions of the others, she never suspected that they had all brought into the world with them any natural tendency to evil; and thought it cruel to suppose that such innocent little things had any such wrong propensities as education would not effectually cure. In every thing the complete contrast of Mrs. Ranby—as the latter thought education could do nothing, Lady Belfield thought it would do every thing; that there was no good tendency which it would not bring to perfection, and no corruption which it could not completely eradicate. On the operation of a higher influence she placed too little dependence, while Mrs. Ranby rested in an unreasonable trust on an interference not warranted by scripture.

"In regard to her children, Lady Belfield was led by the strength of her affection to extreme indulgence. She encouraged no vice in them, but she did not sufficiently check those indications which are the seeds of vice. She reproved the actual fault, but never thought of implanting a principle which might extirpate the evil from whence the fault sprung; so that the individual error and the individual correction were continually recurring.

"As Mrs. Ranby, I had observed, seldom quoted any sacred writer but St. Paul, I remarked that Lady Belfield admired almost exclusively Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and the historical books of the Bible. Of the Epistles, that of St. James was her favourite; the others she thought chiefly, if not entirely, applicable to the circumstances of the Jews and Pagans, to the converts from among whom they were addressed. If she entertained rather an awful reverence for the doctrinal parts, than an earnest wish to study them, it arose from the common mistake of believing that they were purely speculative, without being aware of their deep practical importance. But if these two ladies were diametrically opposite to each other in certain



points, both were frequently right in what they assumed, and both wrong only in what they rejected. Each contended for one half of that which will not save when disjoined from the other, but which, when united to it, makes up the complete Christian character.

"Lady Belfield, who was, if I may so speak, constitutionally charitable, almost thought that heaven might be purchased by charity. She inverted the valuable superstructure of good works, and laid them as her foundation; and while Mrs. Ranby would not perhaps, much have blamed Moses for breaking the tables of the law, had he only demolished the second, Lady Belfield would have saved the second, as the more important of the two.

"Lady Belfield has less vanity than any woman I ever knew who was not governed by a very strict religious principle. Her modesty never courted the admiration of the world, but her timidity too much dreaded its censure. She would not do a wrong thing to obtain any applause, but she omitted some right ones from the dread of blame."

*(To be continued.)*

---

## ECCLESIASTICAL NEWS.

---

*Newark, New-Jersey.*

### NEW EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

THE corner-stone of this edifice, now erecting in this town, was laid on Saturday the 22d May. The ceremony was conducted in the following manner:—The Rector and Corporation, with the lay-members generally of the congregation, assembled at four o'clock in the afternoon at Wilt's hotel, and formed a procession, in reversed order, the Corporation in the rear: they proceeded to the ground where the building is to be erected. When the procession arrived, it halted and opened to the right and left: as the Corporation walked through, the Rev. Mr. Willard, Rector of the Church, pronounced some select and appropriate passages of Scripture—an Anthem, composed for the occasion, was then sung—after which solemn prayers were offered up by the Rev. Rector—the corner-stone was then



up as a palliative to quiet her conscience on account of the sins of her own conduct, for her conduct was remarkably correct, but it sprung from a natural sweetness of temper, joined to a mind not sufficiently informed and guided by scriptural truth. She was candid and teachable; but as she could not help seeing that she had more religion than most of her acquaintance, she felt a secret complacency in observing how far her principles rose above theirs, instead of a humbling conviction of how far her own fell below the requisitions of the gospel.

"The fundamental error was, that she had no distinct view of the corruption of human nature. She often lamented the weaknesses and vices of individuals, but thought all vice an incidental not a radical mischief, the effect of thoughtlessness and casual temptation. She talked with discrimination of the faults of some of her children; but while she rejoiced in the happier dispositions of the others, she never suspected that they had all brought into the world with them any natural tendency to evil; and thought it cruel to suppose that such innocent little things had any such wrong propensities as education would not effectually cure. In every thing the complete contrast of Mrs. Ranby—as the latter thought education could do nothing, Lady Belfield thought it would do every thing; that there was no good tendency which it would not bring to perfection, and no corruption which it could not completely eradicate. On the operation of a higher influence she placed too little dependence, while Mrs. Ranby rested in an unreasonable trust on an interference not warranted by scripture.

"In regard to her children, Lady Belfield was led by the strength of her affection to extreme indulgence. She encouraged no vice in them, but she did not sufficiently check those indications which are the seeds of vice. She reproved the actual fault, but never thought of implanting a principle which might extirpate the evil from whence the fault sprung; so that the individual error and the individual correction were continually recurring.

"As Mrs. Ranby, I had observed, seldom quoted any sacred writer but St. Paul, I remarked that Lady Belfield admired almost exclusively Ecclesiastes, Proverbs, and the historical books of the Bible. Of the Epistles, that of St. James was her favourite; the others she thought chiefly, if not entirely, applicable to the circumstances of the Jews and Pagans, to the converts from among whom they were addressed. If she entertained rather an awful reverence for the doctrinal parts, than an earnest wish to study them, it arose from the common mistake of believing that they were purely speculative, without being aware of their deep practical importance. But if these two ladies were diametrically opposite to each other in certain

points, both were frequently right in what they assumed, and both wrong only in what they rejected. Each contended for one half of that which will not save when disjoined from the other, but which, when united to it, makes up the complete Christian character.

"Lady Belfield, who was, if I may so speak, constitutionally charitable, almost thought that heaven might be purchased by charity. She inverted the valuable superstructure of good works, and laid them as her foundation; and while Mrs. Ranby would not perhaps, much have blamed Moses for breaking the tables of the law, had he only demolished the second, Lady Belfield would have saved the second, as the more important of the two.

"Lady Belfield has less vanity than any woman I ever knew who was not governed by a very strict religious principle. Her modesty never courted the admiration of the world, but her timidity too much dreaded its censure. She would not do a wrong thing to obtain any applause, but she omitted some right ones from the dread of blame."

*(To be continued.)*

---

## ECCLESIASTICAL NEWS.

---

*Newark, New-Jersey.*

### NEW EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

THE corner-stone of this edifice, now erecting in this town, was laid on Saturday the 22d May. The ceremony was conducted in the following manner:—The Rector and Corporation, with the lay-members generally of the congregation, assembled at four o'clock in the afternoon at Wilt's hotel, and formed a procession, in reversed order, the Corporation in the rear: they proceeded to the ground where the building is to be erected. When the procession arrived, it halted and opened to the right and left: as the Corporation walked through, the Rev. Mr. Willard, Rector of the Church, pronounced some select and appropriate passages of Scripture—an Anthem, composed for the occasion, was then sung—after which solemn prayers were offered up by the Rev. Rector—the corner-stone was then

laid by Col. Samuel Ogden, assisted by the Corporation—a Hymn, also composed for the occasion, was now sung—and the business concluded by an elegant and well adapted address, accompanied with a benediction, from the Rev. Mr. Willard, standing on the corner-stone. The ceremony throughout was solemn and impressive, and the most perfect good order prevailed: a large concourse of people attended. The Corporation and laymen retired to the parsonage-house, where they partook of refreshments.

This new building is to be erected on the scite of the former Church, which has been pulled down: it is to be considerably larger than the old Church, will be constructed of stone, and finished in a handsome style.—The promptness which the design to rebuild this Church has met, in every stage of its progress, is honourable to the public spirit and liberality of the congregation.



#### DEATH.

Died at Preston, in Connecticut, on Thursday the 6th of April last, after about a fortnight's illness, of the epidemic typhus fever, Mr. EBENEZER PUNDERSON, *Merchant*, in the 74th year of his age. He was the eldest son of the Rev. EBENEZER PUNDERSON, deceased, who was formally a missionary from the venerable society for the propagation of the gospel in foreign parts, first placed at Groton, in Connecticut, afterwards at New-Haven, and finally at Rye.

Mr. Punderson was firmly established in the doctrines of Christianity, and strongly attached to the principles of the Protestant Episcopal Church.—He was always ready to afford aid to the Church of God, in full proportion to his ability, and ever contributed liberally, of his own accord, to the support of the ministers of Christ. He was fully convinced that it is our indispensable duty to comply with all the ordinances of Christianity, in order to gain the approbation of him, who *came into the world to save sinners*. Accordingly, having been a communicant from his youth, he brought his children forward to all the ordinances of Christianity; and living where Christian ordinances were but little attended to, he used his utmost in-



fluence to bring forward all the well disposed of his acquaintance to baptism and the Lord's supper, as a matter of serious importance.

In the confusion attending the early part of the American Revolution, he judged it expedient to leave his country, and he tarried in England and New-York till the end of the war; when he returned to his family, and was cordially received by his acquaintance very universally, as an honest and well-meaning man.

Nearly the whole of the time of his last sickness, his disorder deprived him of his reason. The funeral was attended on the Saturday following; and a sermon suited to the occasion, delivered by the Rev. John Tyler, Rector of Christ Church, Norwich, to a large concourse of people, who, by the respect they paid to the remains of the deceased, manifested the high esteem which they entertained for him.

In the death of Mr. Punderson, the neighbouring Episcopal parish at Norwich, has met with a heavy loss—his family and surviving relatives are bereaved of an affectionate and constant friend—and the vicinity have lost an upright and valuable member of society.



[We have not numbered the following pages as part of the Magazine; in order that those of our patrons who may think the Magazine worth binding may have it in their power, should they deem it proper to discard from the volume this notice of the Christian's Magazine, from a collision with which, we are persuaded, many of them think neither honour nor advantage can possibly result. We cannot avoid one digression. The original prospectus of the Christian's Magazine appeared more than a year before the first number gratified the eager expectation of its subscribers. Successive numbers, large type, and not overstocked with original matter, "dragged their slow length along," months after the stipulated time of their appearance: and now its Editor clings for support to a colleague; and thus supported, the next number is not to appear till January next; so that there is a chasm of a year in the publication. —All this doubtless affords irrefragable evidence of the singular genius, unrivalled erudition, and unparalleled talents, which at one blow ~~went~~ to silence and lay prostrate the daring young men that ventured to open their mouths in support of the faith and ministry of the primitive ages.]

*Misrepresentation of the Christian's Magazine exposed.*

**I**N the first number of the first volume of the Christian's Magazine there appeared the following, p. 92.

"Some of them, too, may consider Mr. H.'s books as the continuance of a system of attack which commenced several years ago, when a certain preacher declared to the faces of some of the most venerable ministers in this city, that all clergymen not Episcopally ordained, are impostors; their commissions forgeries; and their sacraments blasphemy."

And in a note the following was added.

"A circumstance which rendered the attack an outrage, was the care of the Episcopal Clergy to circulate notice of the ordination, and their solicitude for the attendance of their non-Episcopal brethren."

On the above statement the "Apology for Apostolic Order," addressed to Dr. Mason, contained the following remarks.

"Before you hazarded this most serious charge against the Episcopal clergy—a charge which, fixing on them an 'outrage,' would prove that they possessed neither the mild forbearance of Christians, the dignity of clergymen, nor the manners of gentlemen, should you not have paused, and ascertained, beyond the possibility of mistake, several important particulars? Are you satisfied on good authority that 'the Episcopal clergy expressed a solicitude for the attendance of their non-Episcopal brethren?' I have ascertained from the officiating Bishop and the only two Episcopal clergy now resident in this city who attended the ordination, that they knew nothing of any invitation having been given to the non-Episcopal clergy, or of any solicitude having been expressed for their attendance. But admit the fact: are you able to prove, have you any satisfactory reason to believe, that the Episcopal clergy were previously acquainted with the nature of Mr. Wright's sermon, or with the obnoxious passages to which you refer? You can neither prove, nor have you any satisfactory reason to believe this circumstance—and the truth of this only can authorize you in the serious charge you have brought against the Episcopal clergy, and rescue it from the imputation of being more unjust and indecorous than the conduct which you ascribe to them. I am authorized to assert, that the Episcopal clergy were wholly ignorant what would be the contents of Mr. Wright's sermon, and the style in which he would deem it proper to convey his observations.—'Alas—alas'—'Püdet—püdet'\* —Were I disposed to retort, might I not lament, that persons who make such

\* Your favourite expressions.



pretensions to extraordinary piety, who claim to themselves the exclusive title of 'evangelical,' should forget the first dictate of a truly evangelical spirit, and inconsiderately render themselves liable to the charge of committing an outrage against the very individuals on whom they attempt to fix this crime? No, Sir; no—I make no such retort. I cast no imputation of wilful misrepresentation or perversion. There has been some misapprehension—some want of recollection—and more inconsiderate zeal in this business—Let it be covered with the mantle of charity.\*

After the expiration of two years, the Editor of the Christian's Magazine condescended to defend his statement; with what success our readers shall now have an opportunity to determine. A certificate is introduced from the Rev. Dr. Rodgers, who states, "I was myself personally invited by one of the Episcopal clergy, I think by Dr. Beach." Now, in our opinion, this hesitating thinking is balanced by Dr. Beach's thinking, who still "thinks" that he did not invite Dr. Rodgers. Is the veracity of either of these venerable clergymen impeached? Far from it. The circumstance happened "several years ago," and distant events are not easily recollected. But observe, reader! Dr. M. had asserted, not merely that one non-Episcopal brother, but "the non-Episcopal brethren" were invited—not merely casually invited, but that the Episcopal clergy were "*careful*" to circulate notice of the ordination, and discovered *solicitude* "for the attendance of their non-Episcopal brethren." And the proof of this invitation of "the non-Episcopal brethren," and of this "care" and "solicitude" is contained in the certificate of one non-Episcopal brother, who "thinks" he was invited by Dr. Beach!!

But let us hear Dr. M. again—

"By saying that the circumstance of *inviting* the non-Episcopal clergy rendered the attack an 'outrage,' we neither said nor meant to say, that the other Episcopal clergy had united with the preacher in a plan of insult to their non-Episcopal brethren: but that this circumstance rendered the attack by Mr. Wright an *outrage on his part*."

The sentence containing the charge of an "outrage" we have already quoted at the commencement of these remarks. Let the reader turn to it, and then determine whether Dr. M. has not involved himself in the dilemma of confessing that he writes *obscurely*, or that his charge of an "outrage" has no foundation. But let us admit his explanation—that "the attack by Mr. Wright was an *outrage on his part*." Now, unless Mr. W. knew that the non-Episcopal clergy were invited, his remarks were neither an attack nor an outrage on them. What proof does Dr. M. who is so well acquainted with the force of evidence, allege on this point? "It is presumeable that he (Mr. Wright) knew of invitations which were no secret." Is then *presumption* a sufficient ground on which to charge an individual with an attack and an outrage!! We dismiss this matter, with our former language—

"There has been some misapprehension—some want of recollection—and more inconsiderate zeal in this business—Let it be covered with the mantle of charity."

\* Apology for Apostolic Order, p. 47.

A late number of the Christian's Magazine contained a statement of the conversation between the Rev. Mr. Beasley of Albany, and a young man who had left his communion. To this statement Mr. B. thus replied:—

"It is not true, however, that I 'broke out into an invective against the youth,' that I told him 'he deserved to be excommunicated—that he was leaving the way of salvation—that Jesus Christ would reject him on the great day—and that I, the clergyman, would be a witness against him.' All these things, as asserted in the Christian's Magazine, are *absolutely false*."\*

The certificate of Mr. Christopher Beekman, jun. in the last number of the Christian's Magazine, only proves what we never doubted or denied that he had asserted, that Mr. Beasley used this language. But most certainly we are not prepared to yield the veracity of the Rev. Mr. Beasley to that of Mr. Christopher Beekman, jun. On the conduct of the Rev. Mr. Romeyn in this business, we shall only observe, that before he gave full credit to the statement of this young man, and especially before he communicated this statement to the Rev. Dr. Mason, and authorized its publication, prudence, candour, and common civility required that he should have given Mr. Beasley, with whom he was in habits of social intercourse, an opportunity of defending himself; that he should have had some communication with him on the subject. And if he found that Mr. B.'s statement differed from that of the young man, Christian charity, without impeaching the veracity of the parties, would have concluded that in one or both of them there was some misapprehension, or want of recollection. But to use again our own language, which we have the vanity to think is strictly appropriate—"there was no inquiry, no examination, no hearing. The story just suited the purpose. It is placed in the Christian's Magazine, retouched, indeed, by the soft and delicate pencil of the Editor."\*

The Rev. Mr. Romeyn concludes his certificate in the following words:

"One or two expressions in my letter may possibly be censured, as similar ones in the Christian's Magazine had been so treated, viz. where it said the young man's 'faith was erroneous, and his hope unfounded.' These expressions Presbyterian ministers are in the habit of using concerning their own people who rest in *foras*, in the externals of religion, without a radical change of heart, as this young man did before his conversion. They dare not, as the false prophets whom Ezekiel characterizes, 'daub with untempered mortar;' or like the women of whom he speaks, 'sew pillows to all armholes,' but by manifestation of the truth as the Apostles did, they commend themselves to each man's *conscience* in the sight of God."

Let it be recollected that Mr. Romeyn had described this young man as "devoted" in his "attachment to the Episcopal Church; and that upon his *conversion*" he became "dissatisfied with Episcopal ceremonies and Arminian preaching." Now, can there be any doubt, that the Episcopal clergy and Arminian preachers are those whom Mr. R. states "daub with untempered mortar," and "sew pillows to all armholes;" or

\* Churchman's Magazine, vol. v. p. 475.

+ Ibid. vol. v. p. 478.



that Mr. R. and his Presbyterian brethren, are those who "by manifestation of the truth, as the Apostles did, commend themselves to each man's conscience in the sight of God!" We know not which most to admire in this passage, its *modesty* or its *charity*. We wish not to impute to Mr. R. the want of either, and still less to doubt his piety and amiable disposition. To what then shall we attribute, what we so often perceive in Calvinistic preachers, the arrogant assumption of exclusive evangelical zeal and fidelity, and censorious judgment of others? We refer it to the gloomy, austere, and arrogating spirit of the religious system which they embrace—and which, when not counteracted by other religious principles, or by strong constitutional humility and mildness, never fails to produce self-sufficiency, censoriousness, and spiritual pride.

On the conduct of the Editor of the Christian's Magazine we shall speak as we have always done, and as we shall most certainly continue to do on all fit occasions, with a freedom which can smile at his wrath equally as at his pleasantry, and which cares for the one as little as for the other. Events which happened at a period so distant that it is difficult to ascertain the true state of facts, are exhibited in the Christian's Magazine in such a dress as to expose the Episcopal clergy concerned in them to disgrace and odium. When these statements, founded originally on *ex parte* declarations, are denied, the Editor has recourse to the solitary and indistinct recollection of a non-Episcopal clergyman, whose memory the weight of venerable years has certainly not sharpened, and to the assertions of a young man who discovers in his writing so much weakness and want of judgment, that the cause must be desperate which can confidently rely on his apprehension of the meaning of terms, or on his account of a long conversation. The recollection of one clergyman is thus arrayed against another; the statement of a young man against the solemn asseverations of a respectable minister who was once his pastor. And yet the Editor has "never allowed personalities to mingle with his strictures!"—All this is done with the most perfect good humour, with the innocent intention of enlivening dull religious discussion with a little harmless pleasantry! The spirit that dictated all this, is "utterly unconscious of an emotion which would lead to the hurt of a human being!!" "Irascible" must be the mind that can see in this any ground of crimination! The heart that prompted, and the head that planned this series of personal altercation and attack, meant no "hurt"—only indulged an harmless flight "on the wing of imagination," and kindly "dressed an excoriated spot with a preparation of attic salt;" emulous of the fame of Lucian and Swift! We know not what spirit swayed, or what mantle clothed this prophet; but we are certain it was not the *mantle* of a prophet of Israel, nor the *spirit* of Israel's meek and lowly King.